DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 435 UD 014 635

AUTHOR Healey, Gary W.
TITLE Self Concept: A Comparison of Negro-, Anglo- and Spanish-American Students Across Ethnic, Sex, and Socioeconomic Variables.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 92p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, New Mexico State University
AVAILABLE FROM R & E Research Associates, 4843 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 95070 ($8.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Caucasian Students; Ethnic Groups; *Junior High School Students; Mexican Americans; Negro Students; Psychological Tests; *Racial Differences; *Self Concept; *Sex Differences; *Social Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Spanish Speaking; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS New Mexico; Tennessee Self Concept Scale

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to determine: (1) if differences existed in the self-concept among Negro, Anglo, and Spanish American students; and (2) the extent to which these differences were influenced by ethnic group membership, socioeconomic position, sex, or the interaction among these variables. This study was carried out in a New Mexico public school system and involved students from two junior high schools during the academic year 1968-69. The total group sample was comprised of all ninth grade students in these two schools for which four data indices were available: (1) scores on the "Tennessee Self Concept Scale" (TSCS), (2) scores on the "Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position" (ISP), (3) classification as to ethnic group membership, and (4) sex. The final sample included 607 subjects. The subjects were assigned to categories on the basis of their sex, ethnicity, and social class position. The scores which follow, taken from the TSCS, were separately subjected to a three way classification of variance: (1) Total Positive Score, (2) Identify, (3) Self-Satisfaction, (4) Behavior, (5) Physical Self, (6) Moral-Ethnical Self, (7) Personal Self, (8) Family Self, (9) Social Self, (10) Variability Score, (11) Distribution Score, (12) Total Conflict Score, (13) Self-Criticism Score, and (14) Defense Positive Score. (Author/JM)

SELF CONCEPT: A COMPARISON OF NEGRO-, ANGLO-, AND SPANISH-AMERICAN STUDENTS ACROSS ETHNIC, SEX, AND SOCIOECONOMIC VARIABLES

A Dissertation

New Mexico State University

BY

GARY WILLIAM HEALEY, B.A., M.A.

1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to his advisor, Dr. Richard R. DeBlassie, for his cooperation, encouragement, and guidance throughout this study. To the members of his advisory committee, Dr. Cross, Dr. Easterling, Dr. Ferguson, Dr. Marshall, and Dr. Nicholson, the writer expresses his appreciation for their advice and encouragement.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. John Clem for his aid in helping to obtain the subjects for this investigation. The writer's gratitude is extended to his fellow graduate students, Patricia Grieshop, Maria Grulla, Donald Johnson, Robert Levison, Jay Parnes, Norman Pomerantz, and Alex Sanchez, whose help in the data collection of this study was invaluable. Additional acknowledgment is extended to Mrs. Marian E. Baker for the typing of the final form of this manuscript.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation to his wife, Marilou, for her endless hours of typing, proofreading, data collection, and the scoring of the 607 self concept scales. Her confidence and continual support were invaluable in the completion of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Hypotheses	3
	Assumptions	3
	Importance of the Study	3
	Definitions of Terms	7
	Organization of the Remainder	8
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
	Introduction	12
	Self Concept and Its Relationship to Achievement and Intelligence	13
	Self Concept and Its Relationship to Socioeconomic Position	16
	Self Concept and Its Relationship to Ethnicity	21
	Self Concept and Its Relationship to Sex	25
	Summary	27
III.	METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	38
	Setting and Sample	38
	Instrumentation	39
	Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS)	39
	Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (ISP)	41
	Procedure	41
	Treatment of the Data	42
IV.	THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY	44
	Data on the Hypotheses	44
	Hypothesis one	44
	Hypothesis two	50
	Hypothesis three	50
	Hypothesis four	50
	Additional Findings	52
	Discussion of the Results	52

CHAPTER PAGE

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . 58
Summary 58
The problem 58
Design 58
Results 59
Additional Findings 60
Conclusions 61
Implications for School Personnel 63
Recommendations for Future Research 64

BIBLIOGRAPHY 65

APPENDIX A. Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position. 76

APPENDIX B. Questionnaire 85

APPENDIX C. Schematic Paradigm 86

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Sex	45
II.	Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Ethnic Group	46
III.	Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Socioeconomic Position	47
IV.	Analysis of Variance of the Total Positive Scores	48
V.	Analysis of Variance of Self Satisfaction Scores	49
VI.	Analysis of Variance of Moral-Ethical Self Concept Scores	49
VII.	Analysis of Variance of Social Self Concept Scores	51
VIII.	Analysis of Variance of Physical Self Concept Scores	51
IX.	Analysis of Variance of Self Criticism Scores	53
X.	Analysis of Variance of Defensive Positive Scores	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The use of the concept of self as a construct in the behavioral sciences is comparatively recent. Many psychologists and educators are currently using the theory of self concept for the subject of much experimentation. Theoreticians believe that the self provides a core around which all other perceptions are organized; it gives consistency and continuity to personality. An understanding of self is basic to an understanding of the diverse behaviors of individuals. Lundholm[1] and Combs and Snygg[2] noted that an understanding of the self concept is paramount to an understanding of man's behavior. In addition, Bledsoe and Garrison contended that an individual's perception of himself may well be the central factor influencing his behavior.[3]

The development of the self concept has been the subject of much theorizing and speculation. For example, Gayle felt that children are not born with concepts of themselves. They first begin to form this concept when they realize there are other beings in the world with them. Furthermore, each infant develops within a specific social setting. Each culture to which the child belongs provides a set of expectations that influence the development of behaviors and attitudes that constitute the self structure of the individual.[4]

Some theorists have indicated that social and cultural factors play an extensive role in the development of the self concept. Henton and Johnson noted that the self concept of the child is directly related to his psychological environment, i.e., the sum total of stimulation that has impinged upon him from conception to the present time. They believed that most stimulation comes to the elementary school child from direct contact with others. "From his welter of stimulating experiences the child is able to develop a way of viewing his world, a frame of reference which is imprinted indelibly in him and is reflected in his general behavior."[5]

The self concept develops out of a social definition of the individual's relationship to the world about him. As others important to his life evaluate the person, so he will come to evaluate himself. Kinch believed that the slef concept is the individual's conception of himself as it emerges from social interaction. The self concept, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual.[6]

Davis pointed out that if there is any single factor explaining man's uniqueness it is that he alone has culture.[7] The influence of culture on man's behavior has been well documented by Kneller[8] and Ulman.[9] Broom and Selznick, in writing on the pervasive influence of culture, contended that the kind of human being an individual becomes depends a great deal on the culture of which he partakes. One's behavior is influenced and directed by the rules and values of one's culture.[10]

The individual's behavior cannot legitimately be studied apart from the social context of the environment in which the person lives. Thus, the development of a self concept is a process which must be examined within a sociocultural setting. Lipton's contention, for example, which dealt with Negro self esteem, was that the development of self esteem should be viewed within the framework of one's cultural heritage. He felt that with the absence of a cultural heritage, a history, and a people's heroes with which to identify there is an associated absence of self esteem.[11]

Gayle stated that the way in which a child looks at himself and his world is caused by the culturally induced behaviors he learns. The cultural heritage of the group to which the child belongs influences certain behavior patterns to the extent that they are often regarded as inborn. In addition, Gayle contended that the influence of subcultural ethnic and socioeconomic factors will permeate the developing self concept of the child.[12] However, an extensive search of the literature has revealed that there exists a considerable amount of confusion with regard to the extent to which sociocultural factors influence the self concept.

Wylie's review of the studies on self concept which have investigated sex differences and socioeconomic class noted that research up to 1958 was filled with inconsistencies and contradictory results, the resolution of which would depend on further investigation.[13] Furthermore, studies which have dealt with self concept and ethnic group differences have, with few exceptions, examined only Negro and white groups.

Researchers, such as Demos[14] and Anderson and Safar,[15] demonstrated that differences exist in attitudes and achievement when Spanish-American children are compared to Anglo children. However, studies dealing with self concept in relation to one of the largest minority groups in the United States, the Spanish-American population, have been minimal.

In summary, the rationale for this study comes from the inadequate knowledge and understanding of the contributing factors which are instrumental in the development of an individual's self concept. Many problems exist with the variety of techniques and designs used in the studies of self concept. Many researchers have used different measures of self concept and different

ways of establishing socioeconomic class position, thus restricting the comparison of results and the ability to generalize beyond the specific study. Furthermore, only a few studies have dealt with the influence of the sex variable on the self concept. In addition, the lack of research dealing with the self concept of the Spanish-American ethnic group provides additional rationale for conducting this study.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purposes of this study were to determine: (1) if differences existed in the self concept among Negro-, Anglo-, and Spanish-American students; and (2) the extent to which these differences were influenced by ethnic group membership, socioeconomic position, sex, or the interaction among these variables.

Hypotheses. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Spanish-American subjects will exhibit a more positive self concept than Negro subjects and Anglo subjects will exhibit a more positive self concept than Spanish-American subjects.

2. Subjects will exhibit differeing degrees of a positive self concept in direct relation to their position on the socioeconomic scale.

3. The sex of the subjects will account for differences in their self concept scores.

4. There will be significant interaction effects among the variables of ethnicity, socioeconomic position, and sex on the self concept.

Assumptions. This study was based upon the following assumptions:

1. The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position is a valid and reliable instrument for determining socio-economic position.

2. Self identification, in conjunction with teacher identification, is an accurate means of assessing ethnic group membership.

Importance of the study. In education and psychology there are many writers who have emphasized the importance of self concept in regard to personality, learning, and counseling. For example, in the area of learning, Combs and Snygg have stated that learning can never be separated from the personality of the learner. Since the perceptual field is always organized with respect to self, differentiations and learning may occur with more or

less reference to self; it can never occur unrelated to self.[16]

A predominant point of view is that the school program which emphasizes the value of the individual and helps him to make effective adjustment to other people is truly preparing pupils for the future. Helping a child gain self respect will help him to develop a self which will be less threatened in the future and as a result more adequate in exploring his environment and in dealing with people.

Since the self concept is a function of experience, what happens to students during their time spent in the educational system must be of vital importance in the development of the phenomenal self. Combs and Snygg stated that there is probably no other agency in society outside the family which has a more profound influence on the development of the individual's concept of self.[17]

The significance of studying self concept within an educational framework is well illustrated by Lecky's work. In his studies of self he cited numerous cases where pupils, after undergoing changes in their self concept, have made startling improvements in their levels of achievement.[18] This type of evidence illustrates that as an individual's self concept changes, behavioral changes follow.

Dinkmeyer reported that there is a considerable body of evidence indicating that a child with a poor self concept tends to be more anxious and less adjusted, less effective in groups and in the tasks of life, whether they be work, social, or sexual, when compared with a child who has a more adequate self concept.[19]

The significance of this study may also be seen as it relates to certain theories of personality.

Lewin and Rogers, two major exponents of the phenomenological approach to understanding personality, placed a major emphasis on the individual self as a mediator of the physical stimuli and his own resultant behavior. The privately apprehended world as seen by the individual self is the core construct of Lewin's and Rogers' theoretical system. To Rogers the most important part of an individual's phenomenal field (how he sees his world) is the self concept of the individual. It is this self concept that determines his behavior.[20] In addition, Lazarus stated:

> Self concepts are complex and variable and they determine how persons will react to and deal with a wide variety of situations. These conceptions of who and what one is not only comprise central values and belief systems, but also include images of oneself as physically

> strong or weak, attractive or unattractive, popular, or unpopular, and so on, based partly on the reflected appraisals of other people with whom one has had contact. According to self theorists, this differentiates portions of the phenomenal field, the self concept, determines all behavior.[21]

Dinkmeyer contended that the individual who is developing an adequate personality has positive perceptions of self that give him the courage to function. He is open to total experience and free to choose. He assesses himself honestly and thus his level of aspiration is more realistic. This individual does not feel inadequate, but instead is spontaneous, creative, and original.[22]

The inadequate personality does not feel equal to the problems of life. This individual thinks of himself as inferior and incompetent. His definitions of self are negative and he lacks the courage to meet the demands of life's tasks.

The development of a positive self concept is necessary for an individual's effectiveness as a learner and also for his mental health.[23] Olson and Wattenberg stated:

> Mental health is dependent on the strength of ego, the wholesomeness of the self concept. As psychoanalysts gain more experience with children as contrasted with adult neurotics, they have more and more stressed understanding of ego psychology. Meanwhile, the proponents of client-centered counseling, led by Carl Rogers, have found their work consisting largely of helping clients gain a self concept which leads to inner harmony.[24]

Apart from the relevance this study has for furthering our understanding in the areas of learning and personality, it has a special significance for the area of guidance and counseling. If one accepts the importance of a counselor knowing his client in terms of how the client sees himself and those around him, then the relevance of this study is obvious. As counselors we need to know more about the influence of such cultural factors as ethnicity and socioeconomic class on clients' lives. If male and female students of different ethnic or socioeconomic origins see themselves differently, then it is essential that those individuals who are involved in the guidance field be aware of these differences so that we can take account of them in our dealings with students.

Societies are perpetuated by teaching their culture, attitudes, ideas, and behavior to the next generation.[25] Depending upon the subgroup of the society to which an individual belongs, he is influenced by differing elements of that culture. Thus, the Negro- and Spanish-American students in this

study are members of the American sociocultural setting, but they are also influenced by elements of their particular subcultural setting.

One's culture is a significant factor in the development of the personalities of the counselees and counselor. The relationship of personality to culture was discussed by Cooley who believed that society and the individual are two aspects of the same process.[26] According to Patterson, the individual absorbs the customs, traditions, and values of his society through social learning as a member of a social group. The individual also learns the behavior appropriate for the many roles he will play in society. As he becomes aware of these behaviors he begins to develop his personality.[27]

Culture has a great influence upon one's personality. Thus, counselors need to be familiar with the cultural backgrounds of their counselees since many disorders and disturbances of the counselees are caused by cultural strains.[28] Seward believed that psychotherapy is one source through which the client in a complex society with many sources of conflict can achieve integration and utilize diversities for creative growth.[29] Patterson believed that too little attention has been given to the background of counselees. He contended that recent studies of subcultures within the American society have made counselors aware that there exist wide differences in cultural and social background among those who come to counselors or psychotherapists for help.[30]

Disorders of the personality often arise from misconceptions of the self which result in the lowered self concept. This in turn involves faulty interpersonal relations and thus the purpose of counseling is to reverse the process which has led to the personality disorder. This counseling situation is affected by the attitudes of the counselee and counselor toward each other, and toward the therapeutic process.[31]

Individuals from different social classes come to counseling with differing attitudes and expectations and a varying readiness to adapt to its requirements and procedures.[32] Therefore, according to this theory, Negro-, Anglo-, and Spanish-American students would react differently to their school counselors, depending upon the values they have incorporated through their own subculture as well as their socioeconomic class.

The counselee's position in society, his socioeconomic class, and his ethnicity--all these influence the attitudes of the counselor toward him. Seward implied that counselees with different cultural backgrounds should be handled differently in therapy.[33] However, Patterson did not believe this is necessary. He contended that the essential significance of cultural and social differences between the counselee and counselor is its effect on

communication and the understanding of the counselee by the counselor.[34] Communication is necessary for understanding, but communication is often hampered by differences in socioeconomic class and ethnicity. Thus, the counselor must become familiar with the meaning of the cultural factors in the counselee's life in order to understand him better as an individual.

A real challenge for psychology and counseling is to be able to predict individual behavior, to understand an individual beyond the normative sense, to know not only how he is like others but also in which ways he is unique. Thus, the keys to psychology and counseling are the self concept and the life style. Raimy stated:

> The self concept is the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past self observation. . . . . [It is] what a person believes about himself. The self concept is the map which each person consults in order to understand himself, especially during moments of crises or choice.[35]

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Social class position. Social class positions were assigned on the basis of scores on the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position. Assignments into the five social classes were determined as follows:

1. Social Class I: scores ranging from eleven to fourteen.
2. Social Class II: scores ranging from fifteen to twenty-seven.
3. Social Class III: scores ranging from twenty-eight to forty-three.
4. Social Class IV: scores ranging from forty-four to sixty.
5. Social Class V: scores ranging from sixty-one to seventy-seven.

Ethnic group. This term designates an aggregation of people who, although members of a larger cultural group (or in the process of transition from one cultural identification to another), have shared characteristics which are not common to all members of the larger culture and which enable them to be thought of as a distinguishable subgroup. The important factor indicating membership in an ethnic group is the identification of self with the group. It is the "we" feeling that is significant.

Anglo. This term refers to the numerically dominant, English-speaking native population whose culture, despite minor regional variations, is that of the United States as a whole. So used, the term designates a residual category that includes anyone not identifiable as Spanish-American, Indian, or Negro in the Southwest.

Spanish-American. This term refers to a member of a population possessing a Spanish or Mexican cultural heritage.

Negro. This is the appellation for a member of a population belonging to the black race.

Self concept. The self concept refers to how an individual perceives himself. Self concept refers to what a person believes he is, how he feels about himself, and how he believes he acts. It also refers to how an individual sees himself physically, morally, socially, and so on.[36]

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE DISSERTATION

The remainder of this dissertation is organized in the following manner. Chapter II includes a review of related literature concerning self concept. The method of investigation is described in Chapter III. The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV. In Chapter V the study is summarized, conclusions are made, and recommendations are proposed.

FOOTNOTES

[1]H. Lundholm, "Reflections upon the Nature of the Psychological Self," Psychological Review, 47:110-27, 1940.

[2]Arthur W. Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 375.

[3]Joseph C. Bledsoe and Karl C. Garrison, The Self Concepts of Elementary School Children in Relation to Their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interests, and Manifest Anxiety, United States Office, Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 1009 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 1.

[4]Raymond F. Gayle, Developmental Behavior (London: The Macmillan Company, Collier-Macmillan, Ltd., 1969), p. 209.

[5]Comradge L. Henton and Edward F. Johnson, Relationship Between Self Concepts of Negro Elementary School Children and Their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interests and Manifest Anxiety, United States Office of Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 1592 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 72.

[6]John W. Kinch, "A Formalized Theory of the Self Concept," American Journal of Sociology, 68:481-86, 1963.

[7]Kingsley Davis, Human Society (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), p. 3.

[8]George F. Kneller, Educational Anthropology: An Introduction (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), pp. 4-11.

[9]Albert D. Ullman, Sociocultural Foundations of Personality (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), pp. 196-204.

[10]Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 60.

[11]Aaron Lipton, "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self Esteem," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36:211-12, January, 1963.

[12]Gayle, op. cit., pp. 203-24.

[13]Ruth C. Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), p. 147.

[14]G.D. Demos, "Attitudes of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Groups Toward Education," Journal of Social Psychology, 53:249-56, 1962.

[15]James G. Anderson and Dwight Safar, "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," Sociology of Education, 40:219-30, Summer, 1967.

[16]Combs and Snygg, op. cit., pp. 190-209.

[17]Ibid., p. 377.

[18]P. Lecky, Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality (New York: Island Press, 1945), p. 73.

[19]Don C. Dinkmeyer, Child Development: The Emerging Self (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 212.

[20]Richard S. Lazarus, Personality and Adjustment (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 61.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Dinkmeyer, op. cit., p. 213.

[23]Ibid., p. 214.

[24]W. Olson and W. Wattenberg, "The Role of the School in Mental Health," Mental Health in Modern Education, Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 105.

[25]C.H. Patterson, Counseling and Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 79.

[26]C.H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 3.

[27]Patterson, loc. cit.

[28]Margaret Mead, "The Implications of Culture Change for Personality Development," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 17:633-46, 1947.

[29]Georgene H. Seward, Psychotherapy and Cultural Conflict (New York: Ronald, 1956), p. 23.

[30]Patterson, op. cit., p. 93.

[31]Ibid., p. 94.

[32]Ibid., p. 99.

[33]Seward, op. cit., p. 10.

[34]Patterson, op. cit., p. 100.

[35]V.C. Raimy, "The Self Concept as a Factor in Counseling and Personality Organization" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State

University, Columbus, 1943), p. 7.

[56]William H. Fitts, Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965), p. 2.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature was undertaken to investigate related studies regarding: (1) the relationship which exists among self concept, achievement, and intelligence; (2) the relationship which exists between self concept and socioeconomic position; (3) the relationship which exists between self concept and ethnicity; and (4) the relationship which exists between self concept and sex.

I. INTRODUCTION

As was discussed in Chapter I, many factors contribute to the development of the self concept, and it becomes extremely important for educators to understand the self concept as a determinant of human behavior. A recently completed survey of the major concerns of school districts indicated that self concept is the number one issue.[1] School people now realize that feelings of personal or self worth play a critical role in human happiness and effectiveness.

William James, an early American spychologist, believed the self concept to be vitally important in behavior. When Gestalt psychology came to the United States, in the mid-thirties, the self concept theory again was considered crucial in understanding human behavior. Today, leaders in the theory of phenomenology, such as Rogers, Snygg, Combs, and Maslow, consider the self as the prime variable in behavior as well as in education and learning.

According to Lipton, the roots of the desire to learn are deep and multi-branched. The development of a positive self concept is one of the most important and significant of these branches. In Lipton's words, to know oneself and to value oneself contribute a great part to the development of "an able learner, a curious learner, and a mature learner."[2] Similarly, Hawk stated that regardless of the amount of knowledge imparted, education has failed when selves of pupils are inadequate, defensive, and characterized by a general feeling of incompetence in what matters to them.[3]

The importance of self concept in influencing behavior is widespread, but according to Coopersmith, most of the ideas and evidence concerning the subject remains rather vague and intuitive.[4] Objective and scientifically

organized research is needed to produce tested information on the subject.

The purpose of the present review of literature was to present some of the more representative studies which have dealt with the self concept and how it may be related to behavior, such as achievement. Also, the present review was concerned with the influence of sociocultural factors such as socio-economic position, ethnicity, and sex on the self concept.

II. SELF CONCEPT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ACHIEVEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE

A critical inquiry facing educators is why some students are positively oriented toward academic pursuits while others are negatively inclined when both have comparable ability. Evidence indicating that a relationship exists between self concept and school achievement is substantial.

Lumpkin, in studying the relationship of self concept to reading achievement of fifth grade children, found significant relationships between pupils' self concepts as revealed in an analysis of the data secured and achievement in reading. Overachievers revealed significantly more positive self concepts, high levels of adjustment, and saw themselves as liking reading. Both teachers and peers viewed these children positively. Underachievers in reading made significantly lower scores on measures of academic achievement. A negative perception of self and a desire to be different from the self as seen by themselves was manifested by the underachievers.[5]

Another study dealing with reading achievement was undertaken by Roth, whose data supported the proposition that there would be significant differences in the self perceptions of those who improved, did not improve, and dropped out in a college reading improvement program. Other findings by Roth, such as changes in self concept and grade-point average indicated further support for the theory that those who achieve, as well as those who do not, do so as a result of the needs of their own self concept.[6]

Wattenberg and Clifford did a study to show the relationship of the self concept to beginning achievement in reading. The results suggested that measures of self concept at the kindergarten level would add significantly to the predictive efficiency now attainable through tests of mental ability. They found that self concept stands in a causal relationship to reading achievement.[7]

Bodwin offered further evidence through a study on the relationship between immature self concept and certain educational disabilities of children in grades three through six. He found that a positive and significant

relationship existed between immature self concept and reading disability, with correlations of .72 on the third grade level and .62 on the sixth grade level. He also found that a positive and significant relationship existed between immature self concept and arithmetic disability; these correlations were .78 on the third grade level and .68 on the sixth grade level. Correlation between immature self concept and median achievement test scores was .60.[8]

A criticical review of the literature was published in 1961 by Wylie. The relationship between self concept and reading achievement was not specifically reviewed by her. However, pertinent to this literature review was her comment on the influence of the self concept on learning in experimental situations. She stated:

> A number of investigators have been concerned with the relationships between S's self concept and his behavior in experimental learning tasks. The assumption is made that the self concept characteristics are antecedent to the cognitive behavior.[9]

Snyder pointed out that teachers may unintentionally modify the self concepts of students in a manner that is detrimental to satisfactory school achievement. The teacher "needs to take the role of the other" (e.g., lower class Negro) and try to see the situation as it sees it. Snyder contended that the proper selection of reading materials may be useful in developing a self concept that is compatible with desired educational aims.[10]

Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner asserted that when I.Q. is statistically controlled there is a significant and positive correlation between self concept and academic performance. The self concept is positively correlated with the perceived evaluation of the student held by significant others. The student's behavior within the academic setting is largely determined by his academic ability. Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner contended that his concept would apply not only to academic performance but to school behavior in general.[11]

In another study, Brookover, Patterson, and Shailer investigated the question of whether or not self concept of ability was a significant factor in the achievement of junior high school students. The results of their research provided substantial support for this basic hypothesis.[12]

Correlates of self concept were examined by Renzaglia[13] and Reeder[14] who both found that a positive general self concept is significantly related to high academic achievement. These researchers used general personality traits to determine self concept. Sears associated positive self concepts with academic achievement in the elementary school years and contended that

behavior in task situations was affected by previous academic success or failure and by the feelings children had about themselves in such situations.[15] Spache linked learning difficulties with self concept and urged teachers and clinicians to devote their efforts to methods which would facilitate maturation of the self concept.[16]

Additional evidence was reported by Coopersmith, who found a correlation of .36 between positive self concept and school achievement in a group of 102 fifth and sixth grade children.[17] Somewhat earlier, Bruck had found that academic grade-point averages of children in grades three through eleven were influenced by self concept, with a positive and significant relationship existing between self concept and grade-point average on all grade levels.[18] Using the School College and Ability Test, Miller found that performance and achievement on the test were significantly related to feelings of self concept.[19]

Overstreet found a relationship between quality of self evaluations specific to the school area and academic achievement; self evaluations were derived from content analysis of a series of recorded interviews with ninth grade boys and their parents.[20] Walsh, analyzing the self concepts of bright boys with learning difficulties, discovered that when intellectual ability is controlled, self concept is a basic causal factor in determining achievement level in school.[21] Davidson and Greenberg found that the lower the level of self concept, the lower the level of achievement. They reported that high achievers were more able to give their own ideas and to express basic needs, suggesting that a stronger self concept is associated with a greater willingness to risk self expression, certainly a prerequisite for achievement.[22]

Williams and Cole attempted to relate self concept to several dimensions of the child's experience deemed fundamental to effect academic adjustment. It was hypothesized that a child's conception of school would be related to his concept of himself and thus might be construed as an extension of his self concept. Significantly positive correlations were obtained between self concept measures and the following variables: conception of school, social status at school, emotional adjustment, mental ability, reading achievement, and mathematical achievement.[23]

There have been numerous attempts to measure the self concept of Negro students and to associate it with educational achievement. Most have confirmed the weakness and negativeness of the black student's self concept. One notable exception was the Coleman Report which found the level of self concept to be the weakest predictor of achievement in black children, while it was the strongest predictor of achievement for white children. Thus, this

study implied that although self concept may be high, it is not related to achievement.[24] Poussaint and Atkinson stated that other studies disagree with this finding; they thought self concept high but inversely related to achievement or low and directly related to achievement.[25]

Poussaint and Atkinson's investigations concluded that no evidence was shown that low levels of self concept are associated with optimal levels of achievement. Since the black youth's self concept is generally more negative than that of whites and may motivate them not to perform to the best of their ability, the black youth therefore competes at a disadvantage with the white youth.[26]

Deutsch undertook a study in which he compared students in two schools of low socioeconomic position, one all Negro and the other 94 percent white. Both groups were retarded in scholastic achievement, but those in Negro schools especially so. In all comparisons the Negro children had significantly more negative self concepts than the white children.[27] Clift, discussing factors related to the education of Negro youth in his research, believed that there is overwhelming evidence that negative self concepts of Negro students are related to poor scholastic achievement.[28]

Wylie dealt chiefly with hypotheses concerning associations between self concept of the "ability to do schoolwork" and each of three variables: sex, race (Negro and white), and occupational level of the students' fathers. The following hypotheses were supported by Wylie: (1) That more modest self estimates of ability occur in girls than in boys; (2) that more modest self estimates of ability occur in Negroes than in whites; and (3) that more modest self estimates of ability occur in students whose fathers are in higher levels of occupations.[29]

III. SELF CONCEPT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIOECONOMIC POSITION

One's culture is partly determined by the education of his parents and by the position on the occupational scale where the family is located. Some evidence exists indicating that one's culture and environment can cause either positive or negative feelings of self. According to Snyder, an individual's behavior is largely determined by his self concept which emerges from the social situations in which the individual participates.[30] However, evidence in regard to this pertinent issue of self concept and its relationship to socioeconomic class is currently incomplete and conflicting.

Klausner, studying twenty-seven white male adolescents, focused on the influence of the socioeconomic variable. Although his results can only be

considered tentative because of the small number of subjects, he hypothesized that individuals in the higher socioeconomic levels are the most psychosocially isolated and self aggressive. In contrast, individuals in the lower socioeconomic class react to perceived insecurity and inferiority by aggression and self assertion. Also, Klausner found that members of the same socioeconomic grouping tend to have a more homogeneous self concept.[31]

Two additional studies have investigated the relationship between socioeconomic status and self concept. Hill felt that perhaps class status affects one's self acceptance. He found no consistent association between scores on the Index of Status Characteristics and scores on Phillip's Questionnaire concerning self and other acceptance.[32] Mason studies the self concept, especially feelings of self worth, as a function of age, economic status, and living conditions. Uncontrolled variables in Mason's design made it impossible to assign intergroup differences in self concept to any of the variables under study.[33]

Wylie, in her review of the literature, which included the studies of Klausner, Hill, and Mason, contended that up through 1958, nothing could be concluded about the relationship between socioeconomic class and the self concept.[34]

Two later studies which examined the effects of social class on the self concept were those of Bieri and Lobeck[35] and McDonald and Gynther.[36] Bieri and Lobeck assessed the effects of social class on the self concept of male members of an Army reserve unit. They utilized the Interpersonal Check List which is an instrument that analyzes self and ideal self descriptions in dominance and love scores. Significantly higher dominance scores, a measure of assertiveness and aggressiveness, were found to exist in the upper class subjects, in contrast to lower dominance scores of the lower class subjects. McDonald and Gynther also utilized the Interpersonal Check List and evaluated the effects of sex, race, and social class on the self/ideal-self concepts of adolescents. They found that Negro and white adolescents' statements about their emotional status, physical well being, and interests were influenced by sex and race variables, but social class had no effect on the results. Although McDonald and Gynther found no differences due to social class, this is not necessarily contradictory to the study done by Bieri and Lobeck which did find class differences since McDonald and Gynther used a different measure of social class than was used by Bieri and Lobeck.

Further research by McDonald and Gynther in 1965 revealed once again that race and sex have a marked influence on one's self and ideal self concepts, but socioeconomic status did not affect these concepts. In their

discussion of this study, the authors related that these findings should be considered tentative only since previous studies and their own study had all used different measures of social class.[37]

To complicate the issue even more, Dworkin argued that socio-economic status does affect the way a person views himself. In his study of United States born and foreign-born Mexican-Americans, he asserted that self stereotypes and self images are the result of one's socioeconomic frame of reference rather than their membership in an ethnic group. In studying foreign born and native born Mexican-Americans in the lower socioeconomic class, Dworkin hypothesized that foreign born Mexican-Americans who have recently come to the United States employ more positive, favorable, and optimistic self images in describing themselves than do the Mexican-Americans born in the United States who have lived in the same blighted area all of their lives. His results confirmed this hypothesis and have been tentatively interpreted in the following way. An individual's frame of reference determines his evaluation of his present socioeconomic condition and his attitudes toward himself within his social situation. Since the native born Mexican-American may have employed the Anglo as a reference, comparing the Anglo's socioeconomic condition with his own and noting his relative disadvantage, he would have a poorer self image than the foreign born Mexican-American who employed his peer group in Mexico as a reference group with which he compared his socioeconomic condition. The contrastingly poor socioeconomic conditions of the Mexican peer group places the Mexican-American at a relative advantage.[38]

Other writers who contended that the socially disadvantaged, or members of the lower socioeconomic classes, possess low self concepts, self deflation, and self depreciation, were Ausubel and Ausubel[39] and Battle and Rotter.[40] In addition, according to Carroll, children from the lower socioeconomic positions tend to aspire to ideals of personal beauty and fame, not to the moral and intellectual qualities characteristic of the middle class child.[41] Thus, this finding would suggest differences in the self concepts of these two classes. Furthermore, Hawk found that a child's socioeconomic status greatly influences his academic success which results in either a positive or negative self concept.[42]

In a study of 400 children, Deutsch found convincing evidence that Negro and white children who are from low socioeconomic environments often have low concepts of themselves. However, Deutsch found self concepts generally more negative among the Negroes in the group. He suggested that success experience is the key to positive view of the self. He contended that lower class children enter school so poorly prepared to produce what the school demands that initial failures are most inevitable, and the school experience becomes negatively rather than positively reinforced."[43]

Munat concluded that low socioeconomic children who reside in urban ghettos participate in senseless violence in the cities and this is usually attributable to a massive sense of personal worthlessness. They cannot answer the question of "Who am I" and thus possess a negative self concept. Munat also noticed that a child raised in an impoverished environment may have his self concept distorted by crippled powers of conceptualization.[44]

In a study done by Crosswait, black and white subjects representing three economic classifications were used: (1) self supporting, economically sufficient families, i.e., with incomes above $4,000 a year; (2) self supporting, economically depressed families, i.e., with incomes below $4,000 per year; and (3) public welfare families. Crosswait found significant differences in terms of self concept existed among Negroes when children from self supporting, economically depressed families and children from economically sufficient families were compared. He established no significant differences in self concept between whites and blacks.[45]

Georgeoff concluded from his study that white children of a lower socioeconomic status have a lower self concept than do white children of a higher socioeconomic status.[46] Also, Goldstein found that the lower the social class of patients in a mental health clinic the less worthy do they perceive themselves.[47]

A study which appeared contradictory to Georgeoff's and Goldstein's was done by Godbold who compared students from two schools, one in an area of higher economic affluence and the other from a community of lower economic affluence. Godbold reached the following conclusions: (1) The level of economic affluence from which students come does not necessarily influence their perception of self, and (2) students from communities of lower economic affluence do not necessarily possess more negative attitudes toward themselves than do students from higher economic affluence.[48]

Joseph noted that the low self concepts of Negro students were motivated by the low occupational status of their fathers. To provide support for this contention, he stated that in 1962 47.7 per cent of white working people occupied professional, technical, managerial, and white-collar positions as compared to 18.2 per cent of the Negro working people holding such positions.[49]

Lefkowitz reported that self concept proved to be unrelated to a variety of job-related variables. Yet he noted that the absence of significant correlations was in contradiction to a body of research supporting the existence of a positive relationship between job status and self concept.[50] For example, Maxwell asserted that self concept tended to be more positive as the level of the father's education and thus his socioeconomic status

increased.[51] McIntosh found partial support for socioeconomic background being a correlate of self concept in gifted students.[52]

Rosenberg reported that a self concept scale was developed and applied to high school students of various backgrounds in New York State. He noted that self concept was related to many background factors, such as socioeconomic status and family togetherness. He noted that children from higher social classes were more likely to have high self esteem than those from lower social classes although he found that the differences were not large.[53]

Another contradictory report was done by Silverman. He found no difference in self concept between lower and middle class subjects after administering the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory to all male white school children.[54] However, Sochet, in a study of lower class children, emphasized that most children are aware of social class difference by the age of five and at that age are conscious that the desirable person to be in the world is not a member of the lower class. Between the ages of eight to twelve, Sochet said, a defensive and negative reaction occurs with a note of angry defeat present rather than a positive self concept.[55]

Sochet's findings support the theory that rejecting experiences provided in the middle class school helps to reinforce the lack of self respect in lower class children as reflected in their social class perceptions. Snyder said that education must face the possible incompatibility of the lower class child with the middle class teacher since the teacher's distaste for the manners and language of the lower class child may result in the development of a negative self concept by the child.[56]

A final study discussed in this section of the review of the literature is also another study which is contradictory to the majority of opinions already expressed. Coopersmith found that self concept depended only weakly, if at all, on family social position or income level. The self concept of children from the low social classes was almost as high as the self concept of children in the higher social classes. Coopersmith accounted for these findings by stating:

> Our subjects tended to gauge their individual worth primarily by their achievements and treatment in their own interpersonal environment rather than by more general and abstract norms of success . . . . Probably most persons define success for themselves, not in terms of some external, abstract standard, but in the more direct terms of their day-to-day personal relationships.[57]

IV. SELF CONCEPT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ETHNICITY

The problem of achieving a sense of self worth or a healthy self concept for the minority child, such as the Negro and Mexican-American, is a difficult one. For years the child has been made to feel that he is different from the mainstream of middle class Americans. Allport observed:

> What would happen to your own personality if you heard it said over and over again that you were lazy, a simple child of nature, expected to steal, and had inferior blood? Suppose this opinion were forced on you by the majority of your fellow citizens. And suppose nothing you could do would change this opinion--because you happen to have black skin.[58]

Many individuals believe that with circumstances such as these a child from a minority group cannot develop a self concept adequate to meet the demands which life places upon him.

Anderson stated that the first year of life is the most important for the development of the self concept and by adolescence the self image is seen to be structured.[59] At an early age a child identifies with his ethnic group, according to Clark and Clark. They reported that a Negro child has negative feelings of self by the time he is three or four years old. They contended that one reason for the negative self concepts of Negro children may be that long before these children enter school they are bombarded by all types of communication with which they cannot identify. Clark and Clark noted that this knowledge of racial difference between white and black develops to the point of stability at the age of seven and that the majority of Negro students between the ages of three and seven prefer a white skin color and reject a brown skin color.[60]

Pettigrew summarized twelve studies from 1946 to 1963 dealing with the Negro child's self concept. In his conclusions he stated that in all twelve studies it was found that Negro children preferred white skin and frequently identified themselves as white or showed a [illegible] reluctance to acknowledge themselves as Negro.[61] In one of the studies reviewed by Pettigrew, a white child was quoted as saying, "I like white. I don't like no colored people, they're ashamed of themselves."[62]

Brunner summarized the effects of segregation on the self concept of Negro children as follows: "Serious damage to the self image on the part of both individuals and groups is probably the most devastating derivative of segregation."[63] According to Ausubel and Ausubel, Negro children have lower self concepts because of their status and caste position in society:

segregation causes the development of low motivation and low aspiration and also ambivalent feelings toward white middle class values.[64] Dai discussed the difficulty the Negro child experiences in developing a sense of consistency or identity from having to reconcile conflicting self concepts in adolescence.[65]

Long and Henderson hypothesized that community conditions will affect the self concept and racial concept of Negro and white children and adversely affect the Negro child. The Negro children in the Long and Henderson study were from a lower socioeconomic class than were the white children. Comparison with the white children showed that the Negro children had lower self concepts and were less realistic in evaluating their skin color.[66]

In discussing the Long and Henderson study, McCandless remarked that the results cannot be clearly ascribed to "Negro-ness." He contended that the results might have been due entirely to the effects of poverty and low social status.

> . . . although it is probable that the discriminatory practices to which the Negro is subjected in the United States (more obvious in the rural South than elsewhere) contribute substantially to their findings, over and above the effects of social class.[67]

Georgoff found that many of the negative self concepts possessed by Negro children are often the result of the lack of knowledge about the race's history, culture, and contribution to American and world civilization. His research proved this to be correct by utilizing a curriculum which portrayed Negro contributions. He subsequently found a higher self-concept in black students who participated in this curriculum.[68]

Haggstrom found that Negroes living in segregated communities have lower self concepts than Negroes living in integrated communities because the Negro community is a symbol of Negro inferiority. His findings thus give some evidence to the theory that the Negro community depresses the self concept of its members.[69] Cliff declared that de facto segregation perpetuates and enforces negative self concepts for Negroes as individuals and as a group.[70] According to Smith, Negro children from urban slums grow up developing feelings of shame, inferiority, self depreciation, and self rejection.[71]

Pouissaint and Atkinson contended that the generalized other (person) whose attitudes the Negro child assumes and the looking-glass into which he gazes both reflect the same judgment: "He is inferior because he is black." The self concept of a Negro child is a negative one because of his contact with

symbols of caste inferiority, such as segregated schools, neighborhoods, and jobs. Seeing himself as an object of scorn and unworthiness, the black child learns to despise himself and to reject those who are black like himself. A shattered image is reflected by the looking-glass.[72]

Yarrow, Trager, and Daves concluded, from studies of prejudice in preschool children, that both Negro and white children see the Negro as inferior.[73] According to Snyder, the black child in all probability will have a low self concept, conscious or unconscious self hatred, and ambivalence because he experiences discrimination and sees the low social status of his race.[74] Indeed, McCandless found society organized in such a manner as "to lead the Negro child to devalue and perhaps even to reject his own ethnic group."[75] Even among the Negro people, Sister M. Herman noted, to be most loved as a Negro child, the child has to appear least Negro, with Negro parents favoring the lighter children.[76]

Kenneth Clark stressed a somewhat different point in his research. He found that when minority group children observe the fact that they are often segregated, they react with feelings of inferiority. These children are thrown into conflict with regard to feelings about themselves. This conflict leads to self hatred and thus to a negative self concept.[77]

Williams and Byars studied the differences between Negro and white self esteem, using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Their findings indicated that the Negro subjects exhibited significantly greater defensive distortion of their self descriptions than did the white subjects on the Defense-Positiveness scale. In general, the results showed that the Negro adolescent is negative in self perception, quite defensive in his self description, and lacking a clear, consistent picture of himself. For the Negroes in this study a mean almost two standard deviations above the normative mean was obtained on an assessment of conflict, contradiction, and confusion in self image.[78]

Williams and Byars attributed much of the results of their study to the fact that Negroes have suffered great degradation in the past decades, leading to uncertainty in self identity. However, even those Negroes in integrated schools did not differ significantly from those attending segregated schools. Thus, Williams and Byars stated: "Teachers and counselors in integrated schools should not assume that integration will magically ameliorate all the self doubt and self hate produced by years of racial discrimination." They concluded their study by remarking that the Negro child must be provided with an atmosphere in which he can more fully discover and respect himself.[79]

Rosenberg found that Negro students did not have particularly low

self concepts since ethnicity, according to the author, is not related to self esteem. The status of one's ethnic group is ascribed, not achieved. He contended that the adolescents' own achievements are definitely related to self concept because the adolescent has more control over this factor of his life, whereas ethnicity is an ascribed factor over which the adolescent has not control. Rosenberg further pointed out that one's ethnic status is not likely to affect his self concept, as evidenced by the fact that members of an ethnic group often rank their own group higher than others rank it.[80]

Also, Rosenberg noted that individuals living in a socially homogeneous neighborhood are likely to confine their associations to the people of the same ethnic background, their feelings of self concept may thus be based upon relative prestige within the group rather than between groups. Finally, minority group members may tend to react to the disesteem in which they are held by interpreting this as an expression of selfishness or of discrimination rather than as inadequacy in themselves.[81]

Studies concerned with the self concept of Spanish-American individuals deserve a separate category in and of itself. There are two reasons for this. First, very little research has been done in this area. Second, what has been done is somewhat subjective or inferential in its nature.

Statements such as the following are found frequently in the writings which deal with the Spanish-American student:

> Suffering the same problems of poverty and discrimination of other minority groups, the Mexican-American is additionally handicapped by the language barrier. Bewildered and ashamed of his "backwardness," the Mexican-American child is quickly discouraged and drops out from school within a few years.[82]

Cordova stated: "The low educational achievement of Spanish-American students leads to a lack of gratification and acquisition of a low self concept which contributes to a feeling of alienation from school."[83]

Manuel contended that the Mexican-American child is constantly frustrated and disappointed in school. This frustration promotes feelings of inferiority. The child becomes caught in a syndrome of failure from which he eventually withdraws and assumes the inferior feelings ascribed to him by the school.[84]

None of the three sources cited above is founded on empirical research. They are statements based upon the observer's own experiences and subjective inferences. This is not to say that they are incorrect, but

that they have not been empirically validated.

Carter undertook one of the few studies concerning self concepts of Mexican-American students. He pointed out that most educators are convinced that Mexican-Americans generally possess a more negative concept of self than their Anglo peers. He stressed the contention that because of their marginality--caught between two ways of life, Mexican and American--Mexican-Americans are thought to have difficulty in establishing self identity. It is assumed that the children internalize the "Anglo" stereotype of the "Mexican." However, Carter found just the opposite of these contentions. He discovered Mexican-American students to be quite resilient as a group without thinking of themselves negatively as a group. Their own Mexican-American peer society establishes the norms by which they judge themselves. "Anglo" society seems to be rejected. According to Carter,

> . . . the supposed negative self image of the Mexican-American is, in reality, our own stereotype projected onto him. "Anglos" tend to think of Mexican-Americans in negative ways, and conclude they see themselves in the same light.[85]

One additional point by Carter was that teachers and administrators often believe Mexican-Americans to be inferior and conclude they also see themselves that way. However, Carter pointed out that additional research is needed in this area since his study was conducted in a largely rural, agricultural, and numerically dominant Mexican-American community.[86]

V. SELF CONCEPT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SEX

According to Wylie, there exists much confusion in regard to the relationship between sex and self concept.[87] This particular section of the review of the literature has attempted to clarify some of the research dealing with sex differences and sex-role stereotypes and their influence of self concept.

Rosenkrantz et al. found that despite historical changes in the legal status of women, the sex-role stereotypes continue to be clearly defined and held in agreement by both college men and women. Also, the self concepts of men and women are very similar to the respective stereotypes. In the case of self concept of women, this implies that women also hold negative values of their worth relative to men. Rosenkrantz et al. felt this was surprising since their data were obtained from enlightened, selected college girls who typically hold their own in terms of grades when compared to boys. The authors contended that the stereotypes continue to exist by reason of a

cultural lag.[88]

Rabban pointed out that social class and education appear to influence sex-role stereotypes. As a result, clearer and earlier awareness of sex-role patterns has been found among working-class children rather than among middle class children.[89]

Berger concluded that the female's self evaluation stems from different sources than the male's evaluation. Females tend to derive at least some part of their self evaluation from social certainty, while males tend to rely on other sources. Thus, according to this author, sex differences cannot be ignored when self concept is discussed.[90]

In a study by Brookover, Patterson, and Shailer, which was concerned with self concept of ability, seventh grade girls had significantly higher mean self concept of ability scores than seventh grade boys.[91] Thus, at least in this area of self concept that of ability, it appears that girls at the junior high grade level have more positive concepts of themselves as learners.

In McDonald and Gynther's research, the results concerning the sex variable showed that the boys were higher on dominance scores and the girls were higher on love scores. These findings conform to the sex-role stereotypes associated with being a boy or girl in white culture. Similar findings occured for Negroes. Also, Negro males obtained much higher dominance scores than white males.[92]

In a study of racial and national identities, Harris found that 23 per cent of his subjects defined themselves in terms of racial self identity. Racial identity was given more often by Negro males than by Negro females, and the converse was true for white subjects. Thus, Harris asserted, the racial consciousness of the Negro male is accentuated by his struggle to achieve an equal status with white males, while the Negro female does not directly take part in the competitive struggle with whites.[93]

In additional research by Harris, he found that 80 per cent of Negro females compared with only 38 per cent of Negro males identified themselves in terms of family identity. Also, family identity appeared among 66 per cent of the white subjects and 50 per cent of the Negro subjects.[94]

Further evidence regarding the self concept of Negro males was presented in Joseph's study. He reported that the lower class Negro adult male is seldom regarded as a worthwhile masculine model for his son to emulate. According to Joseph, the Negro son perceives his father as a person with a low status job and is aware of the indifference and hostility toward his father

by whites in a higher socioeconomic class.[95]

However, Williams and Byars found a very pronounced refusal to admit derogatory self perceptions among Negro males.[96] Negro females were found more inclined to accept devaluation of their race than Negro males, according to Radke, Sutherland, and Rosenberg.[97] Smuts concluded that segregation has a more harmful effect on the Negro male than on the Negro female.[98] Thus, Williams and Byars asserted that the Negro male compared to the female may feel a deeper need to present himself in a positive light to society.[99]

Caier and Wambach studied the self evaluation of personality assets and liabilities of Southern white and Negro students. They found that no differences existed between Negro male and female groups on any of the self evaluative measures. However, differences were found within the white group since women had lower self evaluative scores on character traits and achievement and higher self evaluative scores for group behavior.[100]

A last example of a study relating self concept to sex was research done by Carter. He discussed the apparent submissiveness of some Mexican-American girls as often being judged as reflecting the girls' negative self concepts. However, according to Carter, this behavior may be well established in the home culture of the girls as normal and desirable.[101]

VI. SUMMARY

In summarizing the review of the literature, certain conclusions can be reached with regard to each of the sections previously presented. The research dealing with achievement and intelligence clearly illustrates the significance of self concept on these variables. The studies share the common idea that one's self concept can affect his achievement and behavior. Other evidence suggests that significant people can profoundly influence that person's concept of self and consequently affect his achievement level in school.

In prefacing the summary to the remaining sections of the review of the literature, it was found that La Benne concluded, after reviewing the theoretical framework of writers such as Jersild, Whiting and Child, Havighurst and Taba, Adler, Fromm, Horney, and Sullivan, that the sociocultural setting provides the person with his most important motivations. La Benne further contended that the importance of social and cultural influences on self concept and personality development must not be minimized.[102] Certainly one's sex, ethnic group membership, and social class position are important social and cultural variables influencing self concept.

There is no denying the influence of these social and cultural factors, but the problem lies in establishing the degree and extent of their influence. For example, this review of the literature has shown, of the studies discussed in Sections III, IV, and V, those which have examined the influence of social class, ethnicity, or sex variables on self concept: fourteen found socioeconomic or class variables to be important contributions to the development of one's self concept. Seven studies showed socioeconomic or class variables to be irrelevant. Regarding the ethnic variable, seventeen studies found ethnic factors to be very important in their effects on self concept, while only two studies found ethnic factors to be of no consequence.

A major shortcoming of most of these studies, and an important reason for this present study, is that few controlled for ethnicity and socioeconomic position. Only four studies included both variables. Of these four, two showed ethnic variables to be important, one showed socioeconomic position to be relevant and then only for Negroes, and the fourth showed evidence for both ethnic and socioeconomic variables but with the ethnic variable as the most important.

Another important finding established by the review of the literature is the lack of research dealing with self concept and the Spanish-American ethnic group. Although writings of a subjective or qualitative nature are numerous, only a few empirical studies exist. Even within these few studies, not one has directly compared the Spanish-American child with the Anglo child or even with other minority children and also across socioeconomic or class levels.

The review of the literature dealing with sex differences and self concept seems to substantiate Wylie's statement that a great deal of confusion exists in this area.[103]

Some other conclusions which can be drawn from this review are that in studying self concept, sex variables definitely need to be taken into account. The stereotyping of men and women into specific sex roles still appears to be influential in the development of their respective self concepts. There is also some evidence to indicate that social class and education are variables which need to be considered in studying self concept. Finally, the most important finding in this section is that a need exists to take account of the effects that ethnic or racial influences have on the self concepts of males and females. In all of the studies which were involved with ethnic factors, except one, the ethnic variable appeared to be directly or indirectly responsible for differences in the self concepts of males and females. This finding was most noticeable in the research dealing with Negro or Negro and white differences.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Data from personal interview with Allen L. Bernstein, Consultant in Secondary Education, Wayne County Board of Education, November 17, 1966, cited by Wallace La Benne, "A Theoretical Framework for Behavior Analysis and Intervention," Psychology, 5 (2):14, 1968.

[2]Aaron Lipton, "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self Esteem," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36:211-12, January, 1963.

[3]Travis L. Hawk, "Self Concepts of the Socially Disadvantaged," Elementary School Journal, 67(4):192-206, 1967.

[4]Stanley Coopersmith, "Studies in Self Esteem," Scientific American, 218(2):96-106, February, 1968.

[5]Donovan D. Lumpkin, "Relationship of Self Concept to Achievement in Reading," Dissertation Abstracts, 20:204-5, 1959.

[6]Robert M. Roth, "The Role of Self Concept in Achievement," Journal of Experimental Education, 27:265-81, June, 1959.

[7]W.W. Wattenberg, and C. Clifford, "Relationship of Self Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading," Child Development, 35:461-67, 1964.

[8]Raymond F. Bodwin, "The Relationship Between Immature Self Concept and Certain Educational Disabilities," Dissertation Abstracts, 17: 564, 1957.

[9]Ruth Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 200-1.

[10]E.E. Snyder, "Self Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," The Clearing House, 40:242-46, December, 1965.

[11]Wilbur B. Brookover, Edsel L. Erickson, and Lee M. Joiner, "Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement," Sociology of Education, 37:271-79, 1964.

[12]Wilbur B. Brookover, Ann Patterson, and T. Shailer, "The Relationship of Self Images to Achievement in Junior High School Subjects" (East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962).

[13]G. A. Renzaglia, "Some Correlates of the Self Structure as Measured by an Index of Adjustment and Values," Dissertation Abstracts, 12: 784, 1952.

[14]Thelma A. Reeder, "A Study of Some Relationships Between Levels of Self Concept, Academic Achievement and Classroom Adjustment," Dissertation Abstracts, 16:699, 1956.

[15]Pauline S. Sears, "Level of Aspiration in Academically Successful and Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 35:498-536, 1940.

[16]G. Spache, "The Learner's Concept of Self," American Council on Education Studies, 13(35):97-99, 1949.

[17]Stanley Coopersmith, "A Method for Determining Types of Self Esteem," Journal of Educational Research, 59:87-94, 1959.

[18]Max Bruck, "A Study of Age Differences and Sex Differences in the Relationship Between Self Concept and Grade Point Average," Dissertation Abstracts, 17:564, 1957.

[19]William E. Miller, "Factor Analytic Study of Perception of Self, Others, and the Environment," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:969, 1967.

[20]Phoebe L. Overstreet, "Factors Associated with the Quality of Self Evaluations," Dissertation Abstracts, 20:761-62, 1959.

[21]Ann Marie Walsh, Self Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956), p. 52.

[22]Helen H. Davidson and Judith W. Greenberg, Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background (New York: City College of the City University of New York, 1967), pp. 133-34.

[23]Robert L. Williams and Sturgeon Cole, "Self Concept and School Adjustment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46(5):478-81, 1968.

[24]Coleman Report, cited by A. F. Poussaint and C.O. Atkinson, "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," Journal of Negro Education, 37:241-51, Summer, 1968.

[25]A. F. Poussaint and C.O. Atkinson, "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," Journal of Negro Education, 37:241-51, Summer, 1968.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Martin Deutsch, "Minority Groups and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement," The Disadvantaged Child, Martin Deutsch and Associates (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), p. 106.

[28]Virgil A. Clift, "Factors Relating to the Education of Culturally Deprived Negro Youth," Educational Theory, 14:76-82, 1965.

[29]Ruth C. Wylie, "Children's Estimates of Their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Levels," Journal of Personality, 31:203-24, June, 1963.

[30]E.E. Snyder, "Self Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," The Clearing House, 40:242, December, 1965.

[31]Samuel Z. Klausner, "Social Class and Self Concept," Journal of Social Psychology, 38:201-5, 1953.

[32]T. J. Hill, "Attitudes Toward Self: An Experimental Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, 30:395-97, 1957.

[33]Evelyn P. Mason, "Some Factors in Self Judgments," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 10:336-40, 1954.

[34]Ruth C. Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961) p. 138.

[35]J. Bieri and R. Lobeck, "Self Concept Differences in Relation to Identification, Religion, and Social Class," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62:94-98, 1961.

[36]Robert L. McDonald and Malcolm D. Gynther, "MMPI Differences Associated with Sex, Race, and Social Class in Two Adolescent Samples," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 27:112-16, 1963.

[37]Robert L. McDonald and Malcolm D. Gynther, "Relationship of Self and Ideal Self Descriptions with Sex, Race, and Class in Southern Adolescents," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1(1):85-88, 1965.

[38]Anthony G. Dworkin, "Stereotypes and Self Images Held by Native Born and Foreign Born Mexican-Americans," Sociology and Social Research, 49(2):214-24, 1965.

[39]D. P. Ausubel and P. Ausbel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," cited by A. H. Passow (ed.), Education in Depressed Areas (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), pp. 109-41.

[40]Esther S. Battle and J. B. Rotter, "Children's Feelings of Personal Control as Related to Social Class and Ethnic Group," Journal of Personality, 13:482-90, 1963.

[41]R. E. Carroll, "Relation of School Environment to the Moral Ideology and Personal Aspirations of Negro Boys and Girls," School Review, 53:30-38, January, 1945.

[42]Travis L. Hawk, "Self Concepts of the Socially Disadvantaged," Elementary School Journal, 67(4):196-206, 1967.

[43]Deutsch, loc. cit.

[44]Charles E. Munat, "Four, Poor, Nonwhite and Out-of-Sight," Young Children, 24:4-14, October, 1968.

[45]Albert B. Crosswait, Jr., "A Study of Selected Cognitive and Affective Variables Functioning in Two Sub-Groups of Lower Economic Class Fifth and Sixth Grade Pupils in a Non-Metropolitan Area," Dissertation Abstracts, 27:2721-22, 1967.

[46]P. J. Georgeoff, "The Effect of the Curriculum upon the Self Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classes," (paper read at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, February, 1968).

[47]Margaret Goldstein, "Mental Health, Social Status, and Maslow's Need System," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:2123-24, 1967.

[48]Donald H. Godbold, "A Comparison of Attitudes Towards School, Self Perception, and Achievement of Eighth Grade Pupils Attending Junior High Schools in Communities of Different Levels of Economic Affluence,"

Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3460-61, 1968.

[49]E. A. Joseph, "Selected Aspects of the Internality of the Negro in Education," Education, 88:148-52, November, 1967.

[50]J. Lefkowitz, "Self Esteem of Industrial Workers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51(6):521-28, 1967.

[51]Joseph W. Maxwell, "The Relationship of Family Adjustment to the Self Concept of Lower Class Adolescent Males," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:1915-16, 1967.

[52]Dean K. McIntosh, "Correlates of Self Concept in Gifted Students," Dissertation Abstracts, 27:2403, 1967.

[53]Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self Image (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 61.

[54]Marvin I. Silverman, "The Relationship Between Self Esteem and Aggression in Two Social Classes," Dissertation Abstracts, 25:2616, 1964.

[55]M. A. Sochet, "Social Class Awareness of Lower Class Children as Revealed in Their Concepts of Adult Preferences, Ideals, and Self Images," International Review of Education, 10(3):341-46, 1964.

[56]E. E. Snyder, "Self Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," The Clearing House, 40:242-46, December, 1965.

[57]Stanley Coopersmith, "Studies in Self Esteem," Scientific American, 218 (2):101, February, 1968.

[58]Gordon Allport, cited by Jean D. Grambs, "The Self Concept: Basis for Re-Education of Negro Youth," Negro Self Concept: Implications for School and Citizenship, William C. Kvaraceus, editor (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1965), p. 13.

[59]C. M. Anderson, "The Self Image: A Theory of the Dynamics of Behavior," cited by D. E. Hamacheck (ed.), The Self in Growth, Teaching, and Learning (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 7.

[60]Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie P. Clark, "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," Journal of Negro Education, 19:341-51, Summer, 1950.

[61] T. F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the American Negro (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 7.

[62] M. J. Radke and H. G. Trager, "Children's Perceptions of the Social Role of Negroes and Whites," Journal of Psychology, 29:3-33, 1950.

[63] C. Brunner, "Deprivation--Its Effects, Its Remedies," Educational Leadership, 23:103-7, 1965.

[64] D. P. Ausubel and P. Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," Education in Depressed Areas, A. H. Passow, editor (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), pp. 109-41.

[65] G. Dai, "Minority Group Membership and Personality Development," Race Relations: Problems and Theory, J. Masuoka and P. Valien, editors (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), pp. 181-99.

[66] Barbara H. Long and E. H. Henderson, "Self Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," Children: Behavior and Development, Boyd R. McCandless (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 272.

[67] Boyd R. McCandless, Children: Behavior and Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 292.

[68] Georgeoff, loc. cit.

[69] Warren C. Haggstrom, "Self Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes," Dissertation Abstracts, 23:3007-8, 1963.

[70] Virgil A. Clift, "Factors Relating to the Education of Culturally Deprived Negro Youth," Educational Theory, 14:76-82, 1965.

[71] D. H. Smith, "A Speaker Models Project to Enhance Self Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, 36(2):177-80, 1967.

[72] A. F. Poussaint and C. O. Atkinson, "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," Journal of Negro Education, 37:241, 1968.

[73] Marion R. Yarrow, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Daves, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," Genetic Psychology Monograph, 40:327-47, 1949.

[74] Snyder, loc. cit.

[75] Boyd R. McCandless, Children and Adolescents (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 341.

[76] Sister Mary Herman, "Self Concept of the Negro Child," Catholic School Journal, 66:62-63, April, 1966.

[77] Kenneth B. Clark, "Segregated Schools in New York City," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36(6):245, February, 1963.

[78] Robert L. Williams and Harry Byars, "Negro Self Esteem in a Transitional Society: Tennessee Self Concept Scale," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46:120-25, October, 1969.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self Image (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 61-62.

[81] Ibid.

[82] The Mexican-American: Quest for Equality (report by the National Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1969), p. 3.

[83] Ignacio R. Cordova, "The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement and Alienation Among Spanish-American Sixth Grade Students" (paper presented at the Conference on Teacher Education for Mexican-Americans, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, February 15, 1969), p. 5.

[84] Herschel T. Manuel, Spanish Speaking Children of the Southwest (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), p. 149.

[85] Thomas P. Carter, "Negative Self Concepts of Mexican-American Students," School and Society, 96:217-29, March, 1968.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ruth C. Wylie, "Children's Estimates of Their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Levels," Journal of Personality, 31:203, June, 1963.

[87] Paul Rosenkrantz, Helen Deen, Susan Vogel, Inge Broverman, and Donald Broverman, "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(3):287-95, 1968.

[88] M. Rabban, "Sex Role Identification in Young Children in Two Diverse Groups," Psychology Monographs, 42:81-158, 1950.

[89] C.E. Bledsoe, "Sex Differences Related to Self Esteem Factor Structure," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34(6):862-64, 1970.

[90] Wilbur E. Brookover, Ann Patterson, and T. Shailer, "The Relationship of Self Images to Achievement in Junior High School Subjects," (East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962), p. 15.

[91] Robert L. McDonald and Malcolm D. Gynther, "Relationship of Self and Ideal Self Descriptions with Sex, Race, and Class in Southern Adolescents," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1(1):85, 1965.

[92] E.E. Harris, "Racial and National Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and We-Group Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, 36:325-30, Fall, 1967.

[93] E.E. Harris, "Family and Student Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and We-Group Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, 36:17-22, Winter, 1967.

[94] E.A. Clough, "Selected Aspects of the Personality of the Negro in Education," Education, 88:109-12, March, 1967.

[95] Robert L. Williams and Harry Byars, "Negro Self Esteem in a Transitional Society, Tennessee Self Concept Scale," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:329-35, October, 1968.

[96] M. Radke, J. Sutherland, and P. Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13:154-71, 1950.

[97] E.W. Smith, "The Negro Community and the Development of Negro Potential," Journal of Negro Education, 36:438-45, 1967.

[98] Williams and Byars, loc. cit.

[99] Eugene L. Gaier and Helen S. Wambach, "Self Evaluation of Personality Assets and Liabilities of Southern White and Negro Students," Journal of Social Psychology, 44:235-43, February, 1963.

[101] Carter, loc. cit.

[102] Wallace La Grone, "A Theoretical Framework for Behavior Analysis and Intervention," Psychology, 1(2):14-19, 1964.

[103] Ruth C. Wylie, "Children's Estimates of Their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Levels," Journal of Personality, 31:203-24, June, 1963.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

This chapter describes the setting and subject sample used for this study, the measuring instruments, the experimental procedures, and the statistical treatment of the data used in computing the results of the study.

Setting and Sample

This study was carried out in a New Mexico public school system during the academic year 1968-69 and involved students from two junior high schools. These schools are located in a city with an estimated population of 30,000. The two junior high schools had a total student population of 2,034 with 700 ninth grade students. Within the ninth grade, the ethnic breakdown of students was as follows: Anglo, 70 per cent; Spanish-American, 24 per cent; and Negro, 6 per cent. These percentages were similar to the state of New Mexico's ethnic proportions. The census of 1960 established the following ethnic breakdown within the state: White, 63.8 per cent; White with Spanish surname, 28.3 per cent; and Non-White, 7.9 per cent.[1]

The subjects in this sample were also categorized according to socioeconomic class and sex. The percentage of subjects within the categories for each socioeconomic class was as follows: Social class I-II, 21 per cent; Social class III, 27 per cent; Social class IV, 36 per cent; and Social class V, 16 per cent. Female subjects comprised 52 per cent of the sample, and male subjects comprised 48 per cent.

The sample in this study was originally comprised of 630 students from the ninth grade for whom four measures were available: (1) scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), (2) scores on the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (ISP), (3) classification as to ethnic group membership, and (4) sex.

TSCS scores were available for 630 students. Twenty-three subjects were subsequently eliminated from this original sample for the following reasons: (1) Eight subjects could not be classified on the ISP because of incomplete information reported by the subjects; (2) seven subjects were of different ethnic groups than those used in the study; (3) six subjects could not be classified as Anglo- or Spanish-American according to the classification method used in this study; and (4) two subjects either failed to

understand the instructions for taking the TSCS or purposely invalidated their answer sheets. The remaining 607 subjects comprised the sample for this study.

The subjects were assigned to groups on the basis of their sex, ethnicity, and social class position. Social position was determined by the use of the ISP with the two highest groups, I and II, combined because of the small number of subjects in these groups. Justification for combining these groups into a single classification was found in the work of Janke and Havighurst.[2]

Instrumentation

The instruments used in the study were the Tennessee Self Concept Scale[3] and the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position.[4]

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). The TSCS is a standardized Likert-type instrument. The norms for this scale were developed from a sample of 626 persons. The standardization sample included individuals from various parts of the country and ranged in age from 12 to 68. Fitts indicated that the norms were based on approximately equal numbers of both sexes, Negro and white subjects, representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual and educational levels from sixth grade through the Ph.D. degree.[5]

In using the Clinical and Research form of the TSCS, subjects were assessed on fourteen different components of the self concept scales. These components are described in the following section:

1. Total Positive Score. This score reflected the overall level of self esteem. Individuals possessing high scores felt that they were persons of value and worth, tended to like themselves, and had confidence in themselves. People with low scores seemed to be doubtful about their own worth, saw themselves as undesirable, and had little faith or confidence in themselves. Also, individuals with low scores often felt anxious, depressed, and unhappy.

2. Identity. This score reflected how the individual described his basic identity--what he was as he saw himself.

3. Self Satisfaction. This score reflected how the individual felt about the self he perceived. In general, this score reflected the level of self satisfaction or self acceptance.

4. Behavior. This score measured the individual's perception of his own behavior or the way he functioned.

5. Physical Self. This score was an indication of how the individual saw his body, his state of health, his physical appearance, and motor skills.

6. Moral-Ethical Self. This score described the self from a moral-ethical frame of reference--moral worth, relationship to God, and feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person.

7. Personal Self. This score reflected the individual's sense of personal worth, his evaluation of himself apart from his body of his relationship to others. It was a measure of his feelings of adequacy as a person.

8. Family Self. This score measured an individual's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member. It referred to the individual's perception of self in reference to his family.

9. Social Self. This score reflected the person's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction with other people in general.

10. The Variability Score. This score provided a measure of the amount of variability, or inconsistency, from one area of self perception to another. High variability indicated a lack of unity or integration in the person's self concept.

11. The Distribution Score. This score was interpreted as a measure of certainty about the way one sees himself. For example, high scores indicated that the person was very definite and certain in regards to what he said about himself while low scores meant just the opposite.

12. Total Conflict Score. This score was a measure of the conflict in a person's self concept. High scores indicated confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception, while low scores meant better integration, lack of confusion, and lack of conflict in self perception.

13. Self Criticism Score. This scale was composed of items which are mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. Individuals who denied these types of statements were usually being defensive and made a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themselves. Low scores on this scale indicated defensiveness and suggested that the other self concept scales (Numbers 1-9 above) were

possibly artificially elevated by this defensiveness.

14. The Defensive Positive Scale (DP). This was a more subtle measure of defensiveness than the Self Criticism score. A high DP score indicated a positive self description stemming from defensive distortion. A significantly low DP score indicated that the person was lacking in the usual defenses for maintaining even minimal self esteem.[6]

Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (ISP). The ISP was developed to meet the need for an objective, easily applicable procedure to estimate the positions individuals occupy in the status structure of our society. The development of this ISP was dependent upon detailed knowledge of the social structure and procedures social scientists have used to delineate class position. The ISP is premised upon three assumptions: (1) the existence of a status structure in the society, (2) determination of positions in this structure mainly by a few commonly accepted symbolic characteristics, and (3) scaling and combining the characteristics symbolic of status by the use of statistical procedures so that a researcher can quickly, reliably, and meaningfully stratify the population under study.

Occupation and education are the two factors utilized to determine social position. Two items are essential in order to determine the social position of an individual or of a household: (1) the precise occupational role of the head of the household and (2) the amount of formal schooling he has received. Each of these factors is then scaled and weighted to provide a single score. This score may be assigned to one of five social classes.

When the ISP is relied upon to determine class status, differences in individual scores within a specified range are treated as a unit. That there are meaningful differences between the score groups is assumed by this procedure. The assumption of a meaningful correspondence between an estimated class position of individuals and their social behavior has been validated by the use of factor analysis. The validation study demonstrated the existence of classes when mass communication data are used as criteria of social behavior.[7] The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position is included in Appendix A.

Procedure

The TSCS was administered in March, 1969, to all ninth grade students in two [illegible] junior high schools. A questionnaire, to be used in ascertaining socio-economic group membership, and class position, was attached to the TSCS answer sheet.

To ensure the validity of the ISP ratings taken from the data sheet, several precautions were taken. Previous to the administration of the TSCS, the experimenter and the various classroom teachers, in whose English classes the scale was given, devised an assignment which required the students to find out their fathers' educational attainments and occupational duties. This assignment was given with the following rationale in mind. The students would gain information for a possible paper which would be done in conjunction with the school's career week, in progress at the time of testing. Second, all questionnaires which did not include occupational or educational information for assignment of social position were investigated.

Ethnic membership was determined by two separate methods. The first method simply required the student to check one of the ethnic designations listed on the questionnaire (Appendix B). The second method required the teacher to classify each student into the ethnic group to which she believed the student belonged. The teachers were instructed beforehand to attempt to base their judgments concerning ethnic membership by referring to the following criteria: physical features, skin color, surname, language usage, and peer associates.

After the tests and questionnaires were collected, students' choices of their ethnic group membership were compared against the teacher's ethnic classifications of the students. Since only six student ethnic designations and teacher designations conflicted (failed to concur on ethnic membership), these six were eliminated from the study.

For each subject an IBM card was prepared from the data collected. The card contained the sex of the student, ethnic group membership, social class position, and the fourteen scores of the TSCS mentioned previously.

Treatment of the Data

All hypotheses were tested through the use of a fixed model, three-way classification analysis of variance. The computational procedure for constructing F ratios in a three-way classification with unequal cell frequencies was obtained from a method suggested by Myers.[8]

On measures where significant F ratios were obtained, a t test for differences among several means with unequal replications was used to determine the significance of differences among the means. The computational procedure for this t test was suggested by Bruning and Kintz.[9]

The schematic design for this study is presented in Appendix C.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Census of 1960, cited by Herschel T. Manuel, Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), pp. 197-207.

[2]L. L. Janke and Robert J. Havighurst, "Relations Between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community II: Sixteen Year Old Boys and Girls," Journal of Educational Psychology, 36: 499-509, November, 1945.

[3]William H. Fitts, Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965).

[4]A. B. Hollingshead, "Two Factor Index of Social Position" (New Haven, Connecticut, 1957). (Mimeographed.)

[5]Fitts, loc. cit.

[6]Fitts, loc. cit.

[7]Hollingshead, loc. cit.

[8]Jerome L. Myers, Fundamentals of Experimental Design (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966), pp. 108-9.

[9]James L. Bruning and B. L. Kintz, Computational Handbook of Statistics (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1968), pp. 112-14.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

All of the hypotheses were tested through the use of a fixed model, three-way classification analysis of variance. Where significant F ratios were found, the t test was used to determine which specific means differed significantly from each other. To test the requirement that the population variances were equal or homogeneous, the F test was computed to test the assumption of homogeneity of variance.[1] The test indicated that the assumption was tenable for all measures utilized in the study.

The subjects' scores on the fourteen measures of self concept (Chapter III, pages 58-60) were tested by the above model. The means and standard deviation of the scores on the fourteen scales of the TSCS are reported in Table I, II, and III. The scores in these tables are arranged by sex, ethnic group, and social class position. Six of the fourteen measures were found to be significantly influenced by one or more of the independent variables. The eight measures which were unaffected by the independent variables included: Total Positive Score, Identity, Behavior, Personal Self, Family Self, Variability Score, Distribution Score, and Total Conflict score. With the exception of the Total Positive Score, no further mention is made of these eight scores in the results section.

The Total Positive Score, though not significantly influenced by any of the variables, is discussed throughout this chapter because it is considered to be the most important single score since it reflected the overall level of self esteem.

Data on Hypotheses

Hypothesis one. The first hypothesis tested was that the Spanish-American subjects would exhibit a more positive self concept than the Negro subjects and that the Anglo subjects would exhibit a more positive self concept than the Spanish-American subjects. Analysis of variance for the effect of the ethnic variable did not support this hypothesis. Mean Total Positive Scores of the Anglo-, Negro-, and Spanish-American groups were 317.75, 321.69, and 328.70, respectively. The differences between these means were not significant ($F = 1.94$, $df = 2/583$) at the .05 level of confidence (Table IV).

Table I

Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Sex

	Sex			
	Male		Female	
TSCS Scales	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total Positive Score	322.97	11.63	322.47	6.56
Identity	120.86	3.16	121.17	3.09
Self Satisfaction	99.57	5.95	98.09	5.38
Behavior	102.55	4.13	105.20	2.54
Physical Self	69.85	3.00	67.07	1.85
Moral-Ethical Self	61.17	2.67	63.50	2.65
Personal Self	63.71	2.97	61.50	2.11
Family Self	65.06	2.73	65.06	2.05
Social Self	63.13	2.31	65.29	2.67
Self Criticism	35.39	1.96	34.58	2.61
Total Conflict	38.41	3.84	35.51	4.21
Variability	54.03	2.58	54.98	6.61
Distribution	111.90	6.99	110.23	1.18
Defensive-Positive	54.97	4.35	53.73	5.29

Table II

Means and Standard Deviations on the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Ethnic Group

TSCS Scales	Ethnic Group: Anglo Mean	Anglo SD	Negro Mean	Negro SD	Spanish-Amer. Mean	Spanish-Amer. SD
Total Positive Score	317.75	5.59	321.69	7.58	328.70	12.75
Identity	119.44	1.94	122.23	3.77	120.94	2.94
Self Satisfaction	94.39	3.05	96.26	4.37	102.36	6.73
Behavior	102.99	2.62	103.20	3.71	105.43	4.03
Physical Self	66.56	1.43	69.37	3.06	69.46	2.76
Moral-Ethical Self	62.20	2.01	60.37	1.41	64.47	3.30
Personal Self	61.26	1.32	62.34	3.44	64.20	2.37
Family Self	64.25	.91	65.37	2.23	65.62	3.27
Social Self	63.47	2.17	64.25	2.70	64.93	3.02
Self Criticism	37.01	1.42	34.40	2.70	34.16	1.33
Total Conflict	35.25	2.57	39.29	4.27	36.35	4.64
Variability	55.91	1.97	54.53	4.09	53.18	1.63
Distribution	110.94	4.55	111.51	13.68	110.68	8.69
Defensive-Positive	49.40	1.43	57.45	4.70	56.21	3.05

Table III

Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores on the Fourteen Scales of the TSCS Arranged by Socioeconomic Position

TSCS Scales	Socioeconomic Position							
	I-II		III		IV		V	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total Positive Score	328.67	10.57	328.63	9.66	315.74	4.34	317.92	7.10
Identity	121.68	2.42	123.41	2.48	118.54	1.97	120.43	3.26
Self Satisfaction	102.93	6.63	99.59	4.80	94.66	3.26	94.25	3.46
Behavior	104.18	2.93	105.66	3.58	102.53	3.38	103.13	3.94
Physical Self	69.54	3.01	69.15	3.84	68.09	1.14	67.09	1.94
Moral-Ethical Self	63.30	4.16	62.95	2.94	61.56	1.87	61.56	1.52
Personal Self	63.41	2.10	64.16	2.68	60.72	1.76	61.96	2.15
Family Self	66.25	1.69	66.57	2.60	63.05	1.25	64.35	1.10
Social Self	65.99	2.47	65.77	1.05	62.31	1.87	62.78	2.76
Self Criticism	33.99	3.33	35.48	1.16	35.54	1.15	35.87	2.30
Total Conflict	36.03	2.85	34.18	4.21	38.83	4.40	38.09	3.56
Variability	51.66	2.92	52.30	2.57	57.46	7.40	56.62	2.29
Distribution	108.99	6.98	109.86	9.46	113.89	14.48	111.41	5.85
Defensive-Positive	37.44	7.02	34.96	4.19	32.50	1.33	32.51	3.16

Table IV

Analysis of Variance of the Total Positive Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	1.46	1	1.46	< 1
Ethnicity (E)	492.30	2	246.15	1.94
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	859.47	3	286.49	2.25
S X E	47.94	2	23.97	< 1
S X SP	209.85	3	69.95	< 1
E X SP	727.28	6	121.21	< 1
S X E X SP	166.95	6	27.82	< 1
Within	74,082.52	583	127.07	
Total	76,587.76	606		

The other measures of self concept, Self Satisfaction and Moral-Ethical Self, were found to be influenced by the ethnic variable although they did not provide support for the first hypothesis.

Self Satisfaction scores, which reflected how the individual felt about the self he perceived or the level of self acceptance, were highest for the Spanish-American group and lowest for the Anglo group. The respective Self Satisfaction score means for the Anglo-, Negro-, and Spanish-American groups were 94.39, 96.26, and 102.36. These mean differences were significant ($F = 4.39$, $df = 2/583$) beyond the .025 level of confidence (Table V). A t test for differences among several means with unequal replications was utilized to determine which ethnic group means were significantly different. The results indicated the mean score differences between the Anglo and Negro group were significant at the .05 level of confidence. In addition, the Anglo and Negro mean scores differed significantly from the Spanish-American mean score at the .0005 level of confidence.

The second measure of self concept which was affected by the influence of the ethnic variable was the Moral-Ethical Self. On this self concept measure, the Spanish-American group, with a mean score of 64.47, was the highest of the three groups. The Anglo group, with a mean score of 62.20 was second, and the Negro group was lowest with a mean score of 60.37. These differences were significant at the .05 level (Table VI). The results of a t test revealed that the differences among the three ethnic group means were significantly different at the .0005 level.

Table V

Analysis of Variance of Self Satisfaction Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	72.34	1	72.34	2.51
Ethnicity (E)	253.32	2	126.66	4.39**
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	305.67	3	101.89	3.53*
S X E	29.49	2	14.65	< 1
S X SP	6.79	3	2.30	< 1
E X SP	134.84	6	22.41	< 1
S X E X SP	39.94	6	6.66	< 1
Within	16,423.71	569	28.86	
Total	17,667.20	600		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .025$

Table VI

Analysis of Variance of Moral-Ethical Self Concept Scores

Score	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	32.55	1	32.55	3.37
Ethnicity (E)	67.36	2	33.64	3.49*
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	14.99	3	4.99	< 1
S X E	2.44	2	1.24	< 1
S X SP	17.07	3	5.69	< 1
E X SP	54.45	6	9.74	1.01
S X E X SP	9.52	6	1.59	< 1
Within	5,624.25	583	9.67	
Total	5,966.47	606		

* $p < .05$

Hypothesis two. The second hypothesis tested was that subjects would exhibit differing degrees of a positive self concept in direct relation to their position on the socioeconomic scale. It was expected that more positive self concept scores would be found in the higher socioeconomic class positions. The reverse would also be true, that is, lower self concept scores would be exhibited by individuals from the lower socioeconomic positions. In terms of the Total Position Score, the data failed to support this hypothesis.

Partial support for this hypothesis was found on two measures of self concept, Social Self and Self Satisfaction. Moving from the lowest social class position to the highest social class position, the means Social Self Scores were: V = 43.74, IV = 45.31, III = 45.77, and II-I = 45.88. These means differed significantly ($F = 2.88$, $df = 3/340$) at the .05 level of significance (Table VII). A t-test was used to further determine which social class means differed significantly. Results indicated that all means were significantly different at the .05 level. Not only did the means differ significantly at the .05 level, but all means were significantly different at the .001 level with the exception of Social Classes I--II and III.

The other self concept measure which provided support for the second hypothesis was the Self Satisfaction Score. The respective Self Satisfaction Score means for Social Class V (the lowest socioeconomic position), Social Class IV, Social Class III, and the combined Social Classes II and I were 98.33, 99.00, 99.03, and 102.92, respectively. The differences between these means were significant ($F = 3.55$, $df = 3/340$) beyond the .05 level of confidence (Table V, page 68). The results of a t test on these mean scores indicated that all means were significantly different at the .05 level and with the exception of Social Classes IV and V these mean score differences were significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis three. The third hypothesis tested was that the sex of the subjects would account for differences in the self concept scores. In terms of the Total Position Score, the results of this study failed to support the third hypothesis. Partial support for this hypothesis was found in the data obtained on the Physical Self Scores. The mean for the male subjects' Physical Self Score was 50.91. This was significantly higher ($F = 3.33$, $df = 1/340$, $p < .05$) than the mean score 47.37 which the girls obtained on this measure of Physical Self (Table VIII).

Hypothesis four. The fourth and final hypothesis tested was that there would be significant interaction effects among the variables of ethnicity, socioeconomic position, and sex on the self concept. The results of this study failed to confirm this hypothesis. No significant interaction effects were found on any measures of self concept.

Table VII

Analysis of Variance of Social Self Concept Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	24.14	1	24.14	3.74
Ethnicity (E)	9.43	2	4.71	< 1
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	67.67	3	21.89	3.39*
S X E	.61	2	.30	< 1
S X SP	9.43	3	3.05	< 1
E X SP	69.52	6	9.59	1.59
S X E X SP	15.48	6	2.61	< 1
Within	6,374.91	593	7.14	
Total	6,596.63	606		

* $p < .05$

Table VIII

Analysis of Variance of Physical Self Concept Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	66.15	1	66.15	5.53**
Ethnicity (E)	43.55	2	21.77	3.61
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	58.8*	3	7.39	.49
S X E	9.53	2	4.77	< 1
S X SP	20.35	3	6.74	< 1
E X SP	23.51	6	4.20	< 1
S X E X SP	24.15	6	4.76	< 1
Within	4,466.74	563	7.55	
Total	5,062.30	606		

* $p < .05$

Additional Findings

Two very significant findings, evidenced by the results of this study but not directly covered by the hypotheses, dealt with the important measures of Self Criticism and Defensive Positiveness.

A basic consideration in the interpretation of self description data is the willingness of the respondent to convey derogatory information about himself. The Self Criticism score and the Defensive Positive Score were incorporated into the TSCS by the test author to enable the user to locate those individuals who are being defensive as they describe themselves and those who make a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themselves. Low Self Criticism Scores indicated defensiveness and suggested that the positive scores, e.g., Total Positive Score, Identity, Self Satisfaction, and Behavior, may be artifically elevated by this defensiveness. The results of this study illustrated that the Negro- and Spanish-American groups were considerably more defensive than the Anglo group. The mean Self Criticism Scores for the Spanish-American, Negro, and Anglo groups were 34.16, 34.40, and 37.01, respectively. These differences were significant ($F = 4.73$, $df = 2/543$) at the .01 level of confidence (Table IX). The results of a t test on these three means showed the difference between the Negro- and Spanish-American mean scores to be significant at the .05 level. The Anglo and Negro mean score differences and the Anglo- and Spanish-American mean score differences were significant at the .0005 level.

High Defensive Positive Scores indicated a positive self description which was the result of defensive distortion. The Spanish-American and Negro group mean scores were 56.20 and 57.45, respectively. The Anglo group mean was 49.40. The differences between these means were significant ($F = 7.96$, $df = 2/543$) beyond the .001 level of confidence (Table X). The results of a t test used to determine which ethnic group means were significant indicated that all means differed significantly at the .0005 level of confidence.

Discussion of the Results

Of the fourteen measures of self concept assessed in this study, four scores were affected by the ethnic variable, Self Criticism, Defensive-Positive, Self Satisfaction, and Moral-Ethical Self. Before discussing these four scores, an explanation of the results dealing with the Total Positive Score is essential. As explained in Chapter III, this score was designated as the most important score of the TSCS since it is an overall measure of self esteem. Nevertheless, this measure of self concept was not affected by any of the independent variables in this study. With regard to the first hypothesis the

Table IX

Analysis of Variance of Self Criticism Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	1.01	1	1.01	< 1
Ethnicity (E)	39.97	2	19.99	4.73***
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	14.37	3	4.79	1.13
S X E	9.99	2	4.99	1.18
S X SP	14.31	3	4.77	1.12
E X SP	44.39	6	7.40	1.75
S X E X SP	4.70	6	.78	< 1
Within	2,463.23	583	4.23	
Total	2,591.96	606		

*** $p < .01$

Table X

Analysis of Variance of Defensive Positive Scores

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	9.35	1	9.35	< 1
Ethnicity (E)	300.49	2	150.23	7.86****
Socioeconomic Position (SP)	100.36	3	33.45	1.75
S X E	13.36	2	6.68	< 1
S X SP	21.77	33	7.26	< 1
E X SP	120.62	6	20.10	1.05
S X E X SP	6.49	6	1.08	< 1
Within	11,145.42	583	19.12	
Total	11,717.46	606		

**** $p < .001$

Total Positive Score did not differ significantly among the three ethnic groups as was predicted. In fact, the means of the Total Positive Scores exhibited by the three ethnic groups were contradictory with regard to the direction they should have taken according to the first hypothesis. Instead of having the highest mean score, the Anglo group had the lowest mean score. The Negro group, which was expected to be the lowest in terms of mean self concept scores, fell between the Anglo- and Spanish-American group. The Spanish-American self concept scores, instead of falling between the Anglo and Negro group, were the highest of the three ethnic groups. This apparent contradiction and the failure to find any significant ethnic differences in self concept can probably be accounted for by the following findings.

First, upon examination of the Self Criticism and Defensive-Positive Scores, it is very apparent that significant differences existed between the three ethnic groups on both these measures. The Self Criticism scores for the two minority groups were significantly below the Self Criticism scores for the Anglo group. The Self Criticism Score, as previously mentioned, is an indication or measure of defensiveness and this defensiveness could have artificially elevated the Total Positive Scores. This helps to explain the higher means on the Total Positive Score for the two minority groups. Further evidence that the Total Positive Scores may have been artificially elevated for the two minority groups was provided by the results obtained on the Defensive Positive Scores. The mean scores of 56.21 and 57.45 for the Spanish-American and Negro groups, respectively, were significantly higher than the Anglo mean score of 49.38.

In summary, it appears that the Total Positive Scores of the Negro- and Spanish-American groups were probably higher than they would have been if the individuals in these two ethnic groups had not responded so defensively. Therefore, it seems a reasonable precaution that the findings of this study must be interpreted with this fact regarding defensiveness in mind.

A second explanation which might provide some evidence for the failure of this study to confirm the first hypothesis and which would also help to explain why none of the independent variables had an effect on the Total Positive Score is provided by Wylie. She has questioned the validity of studying the self concept as an overall or global self evaluative attitude. She stated that the weak trends and lack of comparability among studies which treat the self concept as a global measure may be partly due to an unanalytical approach to self regarding attitudes.[2] Therefore, the results of this study which found the overall measure of self esteem unaffected by the three independent variables is in keeping with Wylie's findings.

Self Satisfaction, a score which was significantly affected by the ethnic variable, also exhibited the same confounding results that the Total Positive Score exhibited. That is, the Spanish-American group was the most accepting of the self they perceived, while the Negro group scored second on this measure and the Anglo group scored lowest, thus being the least accepting of the self they perceived. This finding can be interpreted in two ways. One, the Self Satisfaction Score may be artificially elevated as was previously conjectured for the Total Positive Score. The defensiveness of the two minority groups may be responsible for the findings associated with the Self Satisfaction Score. However, a second interpretation is that the Spanish-American and Negro groups were in fact more satisfied with the way they perceived themselves than was the Anglo group because the two minority groups' own ethnicity established norms by which they judged themselves. Self Satisfaction, as assessed in this study, may have been the measure which Carter was tapping through his research on self concept of Mexican-Americans, in which he found no differences in feelings of self worth between Mexican-American and Anglo students.[3] Although Carter's work dealt only with Mexican-Americans, it might be conjectured that Negroes, also belonging to a minority group and having their cultural identifications, would operate similarly in terms of perception of self because of their minority group membership.

A final measure of self concept, apparently affected by the ethnic variable, was the measure of Moral-Ethical Self. The results of this study showed that on this measure the Spanish-American subjects scored highest, Anglo subjects scored second, and Negro subjects scored lowest on this scale. Although only conjecture at this point, this finding may be the results of the important role that religion plays in the Spanish-American culture. About one-third of the questions from the Moral-Ethical measure dealt with how the individual feels about his relationship to God and his satisfaction with his religion or his lack of religion. According to Ulibarri, the process of acculturation for the Spanish-Americans has affected all aspects of their lives. However, religion, which has been a cornerstone of their moral code, has been least affected by the transition from the culture of the past to the culture of the present. Ulibarri further contended that religion is still vital to most Spanish-Americans regardless of religious denomination.[4]

The second hypothesis was confirmed on two of the fourteen scales utilized in this study, Social Self and Self Satisfaction. However, once again the overall general measure of self concept, the Total Positive Score, did not differ significantly among the four socioeconomic class positions. On the other hand, one of the specific measures of self concept, the Social Self, which is a measure of a person's sense of adequacy and worth in his

social interaction with other people in general, exemplified the expectation that as one's socioeconomic position increases there is an accompanying increase in the self concept. Even though the mean score for Social Class V was greater than the mean for Social Class IV, the overall trend of these Social Self means was to increase as social class position increased. This finding seems reasonable when one considers that in American society social class position is often interpreted as a measure of a person's worth, with individuals belonging to higher socioeconomic positions being accorded higher status and more prestige. It may be hypothesized that these positions of status with their attached prestige are often the major sources from which is drawn our sense of adequacy and self worth, especially in terms of a social self image.

In keeping with the above rationale, the results of the Self Satisfaction Scores across socioeconomic position indicated that individuals in the lower socioeconomic classes were not as satisfied or accepting with the way in which they saw themselves as were those individuals in the higher socioeconomic positions.

The third hypothesis with regard to the Total Positive Score was not significantly affected by sex differences. However, Physical Self, a specific measure of the total self concept, was significantly affected by sex differences and thus provided partial support for the third hypothesis. Male subjects had significantly higher self concepts than female subjects with regard to their physical appearance, health, skills, and sexuality. This finding can probably be explained if one takes into consideration the age and grad. level of the subjects. For example, Jersild found that boys were not as concerned about their physical appearance at the ninth grade level as girls.[5] Therefore, there exists some evidence indicating that, at least at the ninth grade level, girls may be overly critical of their appearance and their ability to attract members of the opposite sex.

The failure to confirm hypothesis four which dealt with significant interaction effects is not difficult to account for in light of the conflicting results obtained by previous studies. It was hypothesized that there would be interaction between the sex and ethnic variables as was found in Williams and Byars' study.[6] However, in keeping with the findings of this present study, Gaier and Wambach concluded that no differences existed in the self concept of Negro males and females.[7]

It was also hypothesized that self concept scores would vary across socioeconomic position within each of the three ethnic groups. This hypothesis was made on the basis of previous findings which showed the influences of socioeconomic and ethnic differences. It was assumed that if the

socioeconomic variable was responsible for self concept differences, then these differences should occur not only as a main effect of the socioeconomic variable but within the ethnic groups as well. The results of this study provided no evidence to support this hypothesis.

FOOTNOTES

[1]W. James Popham, Educational Statistics (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 145-46.

[2]Ruth C. Wylie, "Children's Estimates of Their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Levels," Journal of Personality, 31:203-24, June, 1963.

[3]Thomas P. Carter, "Negative Self Concepts of Mexican-American Students," School and Society, 96:217-29, March 30, 1968.

[4]Horacio Ulibarri, The Effect of Cultural Difference in the Education of Spanish-Americans (report prepared for the University of New Mexico Research Study on the Adjustment of Indian and Non-Indian Children in the Public Schools of New Mexico. Albuquerque: College of Education, University of New Mexico, September, 1958), pp. 21-23.

[5]Arthur T. Jersild, The Psychology of Adolescence (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 65.

[6]Robert L. Williams and Harry Byars, "Negro Self Esteem in a Transitional Society: Tennessee Self Concept Scale," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:120-25, October, 1968.

[7]Eugene L. Gaier and Helen S. Wambach, "Self Evaluation of Personality Assets and Liabilities of Southern White and Negro Students," Journal of Social Psychology, 51:135-43, February, 1960.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The summary and conclusions of this study are reported in this chapter, along with the implication this investigation has for educators and secondary school guidance counselors.

Summary

The problem. The purposes of this study were to determine: (1) if differences exist in the self concept among Negro-, Anglo-, and Spanish-American students; and (2) the extent to which these differences are influenced by ethnic group membership, socio-economic position, sex, or the interaction among these variables.

Design. This study was carried out in a New Mexico Public school system and involved students from two junior high schools during the academic year 1968-69. The total group sample was comprised of all ninth grade students in these two schools for which four data indices were available: (1) scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), (2) scores on the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (ISP), (3) classification as to ethnic group membership, and (4) sex.

Data were available for 630 students. Twenty-three subjects were subsequently eliminated from this original sample for the following reasons: (1) Eight subjects could not be classified on the ISP because of incomplete information reported by the subjects; (2) seven subjects were of different ethnic groups than those used in the study; (3) six subjects could not be classified as Anglo- or Spanish-American according to the classification method used in this study; and (4) two subjects either failed to understand the instructions for taking the TSCS or purposely invalidated their answers sheets. The remaining 607 subjects comprised the sample for this study.

The subjects were assigned to categories on the basis of their sex, ethnicity, and social class position. Social class position was determined by the use of the ISP with the two highest classes, I and II, combined because of the small number of subjects in these classes. This resulted in four socioeconomic groups. These groups with their respective Ns were as follows: (1) Social Class I-II, N = 130; (2) Social Class III, N = 161; (3) Social Class IV, N = 221; and (4) Social Class V, N = 95.

The total sample was also divided into three ethnic groups: Anglo-, N = 425; Negro-, N = 40; and Spanish-American, N = 142. In addition, the total sample was divided into male and female groups: Females, N = 314; and Males, N = 291.

The statistical treatment described below was subsequently applied to the data. The scores which follow, taken from the TSCS, were separately subjected to a three way classification (sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic position), analysis of variance model: 1. Total Positive Score; 2. Identity; 3. Self Satisfaction; 4. Behavior; 5. Physical Self; 6. Moral-Ethical Self; 7. Personal Self; 8. Family Self; 9. Social Self; 10. Variability Score; 11. Distribution Score; 12. Total Conflict Score; 13. Self Criticism Score; and 14. Defensive Positive Score.

F ratios computed on these scores were used to confirm or reject the hypotheses. Where significant F ratios were found, the t test was used to determine which specific means differed significantly from each other.

The four hypotheses which were tested are as follows:

1. Spanish-American subjects will exhibit a more positive self concept than Negro subjects and Anglo subjects will exhibit a more positive self concept than Spanish-American subjects.

2. Subjects will exhibit differing degrees of a positive self concept in direct relation to their position on the socioeconomic scale.

3. The sex of the subjects will account for differences in their self concept scores.

4. There will be significant interaction effects among the variables of ethnicity, socioeconomic position, and sex on the self concept.

Results. The results of this study as they pertained to the four hypotheses were as follows:

1. Hypothesis one. The results of this study failed to confirm this hypothesis. None of the measures of self concept was found to differ significantly among the three ethnic groups in the direction predicted by the first hypothesis.

2. Hypothesis two. Partial confirmation of the second hypothesis was found. The two measures which provided support for this hypothesis were the Social Self and the Self Satisfaction Scores. The Social Self measure

exhibited significant mean differences at the .05 level of confidence. With the exception of the two lowest social classes, V and IV, Social Self score means increased as social class position increased. A t test on the Social Self score means indicated that all means were significantly different at the .05 level. Not only did the means differ significantly at the .05 level, but all means were significantly different at the .001 level with the exception of Social Classes I-II and III. In addition, the Self Satisfaction measure exhibited significant mean differences at the .05 level of confidence. The Self Satisfaction score means increased as social class position increased. A t test on the Self Satisfaction score means indicated that all means were significantly different at the .05 level and with the exception of Social Classes IV and V these mean score differences were significant at the .001 level.

3. Hypothesis three. The results of this study failed to support the third hypothesis when considered only in relation to the overall Total Positive Score. Partial support for this hypothesis was found in the data obtained on the Physical Self Score. The mean score for the male subjects was significantly higher than the mean score obtained by the female subjects on this measure.

4. Hypothesis four. The results of this study failed to confirm this hypothesis. No significant interaction effects were found on any of the measures of self concept.

Additional findings. Other findings of importance in this study included:

1. The ethnic variable was found to be influential on two measures of self concept: Moral-Ethical Self and Self Satisfaction. The Moral-Ethical Self score was highest for the Spanish-American group, second highest for the Anglo group, and lowest for the Negro group. These differences were significant at the .05 level. The results of a t test revealed that the differences among the three ethnic group means were significantly different at the .0005 level. The Self Satisfaction Score, which reflected the subject's acceptance of how he saw himself, was highest for the Spanish-American group, second highest for the Negro group, and lowest for the Anglo group. These differences were significant at the .025 level. The results of a t test for these means indicated that the mean score differences between the Anglo and Negro groups were significant at the .05 level. The Anglo- and Negro- mean scores differed from the Spanish-American mean score at the .0005 level of significance.

2. The results associated with the Self Criticism Score may be one of the most significant findings of the entire study. This score, which is a

measure of defensiveness and an indication of the subject's deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of himself, differed significantly (.01 level of confidence) among the three ethnic groups. The Spanish-American group exhibited the greatest amount of defensiveness with the Negro and Anglo groups following in that order. The results of a t test on the Self Criticism mean scores for the three ethnic groups showed the difference between the Negro- and Spanish-American mean scores to be significant at the .05 level. The Anglo- and Negro- mean score differences and the Anglo- and Spanish-American mean score differences were significant at the .0005 level.

3. The Defensive Positive Score, a measure of defensive distortion, differed significantly (.001 level of confidence) among the three ethnic groups. The Negro group exhibited the greatest amount of defensive distortion with the Spanish-American and Anglo groups following in that order. The results of a t test used to determine which ethnic group means were significant indicated that all means differed significantly at the .0005 level of confidence.

Conclusions

The conclusions obtained from this study should be considered with the assumptions of this study kept in mind. These assumptions were as follows:

1. The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position is a valid and reliable instrument for determining socioeconomic position.

2. Self identification, in conjunction with teacher identification, is an accurate means of assessing ethnic group membership.

With these assumptions considered, the following conclusions were made:

1. Male and female subjects, subjects from different socioeconomic positions, and subjects from different ethnic groups did not differ significantly with regard to their overall level of self esteem. Sex, social class position, and ethnic group membership made no difference in terms of how the subjects perceived their worth, liked themselves, or the confidence they had in themselves.

2. Sex, socioeconomic position, and ethnic group membership accounted for differences in the self concept of the subjects although the influence of these variables was limited to specific dimensions of the subjects' self concept. Specific dimensions of the self concept which were

influenced by the variables under study were as follows: Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Social Self, Self Satisfaction, Self Criticism, and Defensive Positive Score.

3. When compared with female subjects, the male subjects reflected that they were more confident or positive about the way in which they evaluated their Physical Self. The boys had a higher self concept with regard to their physical appearance, state of health, both or motor skills, and sexuality when compared to the girls.

4. The socioeconomic class variable was influential with regard to the measure of Social Self. Subjects from the lower social classes did not exhibit the sense of adequacy and worth in social interaction with people in general that subjects from the upper social classes exhibited.

5. As socioeconomic class position increased, there was an increase in the level of satisfaction with the way an individual saw himself. Thus, individuals in the lower socioeconomic classes were not as satisfied or accepting with the way in which they saw themselves as were those individuals in the higher socioeconomic classes.

6. Ethnic group membership was an influential variable in terms of how the subjects perceived themselves on the Moral-Ethical dimension of the self. In terms of the individual's perception of his moral worth, relationship to God, and his feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person, the Spanish-American subjects scored the highest. The Anglo and Negro subjects followed respectively.

7. Ethnic group membership appeared to have some influence on the degree of satisfaction an individual has with the way he saw himself. As a group, the Spanish-Americans were the most satisfied with the way they perceived themselves. On the Self Satisfaction measure, the Negro and Anglo groups followed respectively.

8. The Spanish-American and Negro subjects were less willing than the Anglo subjects to convey derogatory information about themselves. Self Criticism scores of the male and female Spanish-American and Negro subjects indicated that they were significantly more defensive about their reported self esteem than were the Anglo subjects.

9. On the Defensive Positive Score, which is an indication of a positive self description stemming from defensive distortion of the self, Negro and Spanish-American subjects exhibited a greater amount of defensive distortion in their self descriptions than the Anglo subjects.

Implications for School Personnel

The results of this study demonstrated that the factors of sex, socio-economic position, and ethnic group membership are important in terms of their influence on an individual's self concept. These factors do influence the way in which students perceive themselves. However, none of these variables is so influential that it is singularly responsible for the development of an individual's global self concept. Rather, sex, socioeconomic position, and ethnic group membership appear to exert their influence on specific dimensions of an individual's self esteem.

One implication of this investigation is that minority group students are generally less willing to convey derogatory information about themselves and therefore are less apt to communicate their true feelings to the school personnel working with them. Particularly with the students who come from a minority ethnic group, there appears to be more need for the individual to present himself in a positive way. The unwillingness on the part of the Spanish American and Negro students to admit self debasing information about themselves is probably the result of the present civil rights movement with its emphasis on racial pride and self respect.

Teachers and counselors also need to be aware that students from different socioeconomic classes perceive themselves differently on specific dimensions of the self concept. For example, this study indicated that students from lower socioeconomic classes have feelings of inadequacy in situations demanding social interaction with their peers. Therefore, teachers should take into account that students from the lower socioeconomic classes may be unwilling or afraid to interact in the classroom and other school activities. In addition, counselors should be aware that students from lower socioeconomic classes may be hesitant about interacting in group guidance or counseling situations because of their feelings of inadequacy in social situations. Thus, this resistance may be one of the major obstacles to overcome before the counseling process progresses.

Students from the lower social classes are also more likely to be dissatisfied with the self they perceive. Knowledge of this fact is important if the counselor sincerely desires to understand and relate to his counselees. The counselor, being aware of this dissatisfaction, should help the student explore himself in order to set realistic objectives in the student's educational, personal, and vocational planning.

Based on these considerations, it is recommended that the findings of this study be made available to interested school personnel. It is the writer's contention that a broadened understanding of students will occur

from knowledge of the results of this study. Therefore, school personnel who are familiar with these findings should be more able to recognize and to meet students' needs.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research are suggested:

1. Studies should be conducted which could determine to what extent the findings of this study apply for different age levels, i.e., adults as compared with the adolescents of this study. Writers such as Coleman[1] and Kelly[2] have theorized that adolescents possess a culture of their own, including their own values and norms, which may be considerably different from the values and norms of the adult world.

2. This study should be replicated in other settings. Ethnic group members from a rural and urban setting should be directly compared on the same instrument measuring self-concept. It might be hypothesized that individuals from a rural background possess different evaluations of self than individuals from an urban area.

FOOTNOTES

[1]James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 5.

[2]Harry Kelly, "Adolescents: A Suppressed Minority Group," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:459-60, March, 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Brown, Leonard, and Philip Schmidt. Ecology. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Dearing, James L., and B. L. Kirk. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1964.

Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Combs, Arthur W., and Donald Snygg. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Cooley, C. H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribner, 1902.

Davis, Kingsley. Human Society. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Dobbenson, Ira C. Child Development: The Emerging Self. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Gesell, Richard F. Developmental Behavior. London: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Jersild, Arthur T. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Kimble, George F. Educational Anthropology: An Introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Lindzey, Richard G. Personality and Adjustment. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.

Locke, F. Self Consistency: A Theory of Personality. New York: Island Press, 1961.

McCandless, Boyd R. Children and Adolescents. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____. Children: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Myers, Jerome L. Fundamentals of Experimental Design. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

Patterson, C. H. Counseling and Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Pettigrew, T. F. A Profile of the American Negro. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, Inc., 1964.

Peyton, W. James. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Seward, Georgene H. Psychotherapy and Cultural Conflict. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Ullman, Albert D. Sociocultural Foundations of Personality. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Bledsoe, Joseph C., and Karl C. Garrison. The Self Concepts of Elementary School Children in Relation to Their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interests, and Manifest Anxiety. United States Office, Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 1009. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Ann Patterson, and T. Shailer. The Relationship of Self Images to Achievement in Junior High School Subjects. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962.

Davidson, Helen H., and Judith W. Greenberg. Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background. New York: City College of the City University of New York, 1967.

Fitts, William H. Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Beeton, Coxeridge L., and Edward E. Johnson. Relationship Between Self Concepts of Negro Elementary School Children and Their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interests, and Manifest Anxiety. United States Office of Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 1592. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Manuel, Herschel T. Spanish Speaking Children of the Southwest. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.

The Mexican American: Quest for Equality. A Report by the National Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education. Albuquerque, New Mexico: The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1968.

Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Ulibarri, Horacio. The Effect of Cultural Difference in the Education of Spanish-Americans. A Report prepared for the University of New Mexico Research Study on the Adjustment of Indian and Non-Indian Children in the Public Schools of New Mexico. Albuquerque, New Mexico: College of Education, University of New Mexico, September, 1958.

Walsh, Ann Marie. Self Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Wylie, Ruth C. The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

C. PERIODICALS

Anderson, James G., and Dwight Safer. "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," Sociology of Education, 40:219-38, Summer, 1967.

Battle, Esther S., and J. B. Rotter. "Children's Feelings of Personal Control as Related to Social Class and Ethnic Group," Journal of Personality, 31:482-90, 1963.

Berger, C. R. "Sex Differences Related to Self Esteem Factor Structure," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(6):642-44, 1968.

Bieri, J., and R. Lobeck. "Self Concept Differences in Relation to Identification, Religion, and Social Class," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62:94-98, 1961.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Edsel L. Erickson, and Lee M. Joiner. "Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement," Sociology of Education, 37: 271-79, 1964.

Brunner, C. "Deprivation--Its Effects, Its Remedies," Educational Leadership, 23:102-7, 1965.

Carroll, R. E. "Relations of School Environment to the Moral Ideology and Personal Aspirations of Negro Boys and Girls," School Review, 53: 39-54, January, 1945.

Carter, Thomas P. "Negative Self Concepts of Mexican-American Students," School and Society, 96:217-29, March 30, 1968.

Clark, Kenneth B. "Segregated Schools in New York City," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36(6):245-55, February, 1963.

_____, and Mamie P. Clark. "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," Journal of Negro Education, 19: 341-50, Summer, 1950.

Cliff, Virgil A. "Factors Relating to the Education of Culturally Deprived Negro Youth," Educational Theory, 14:78-82, 1965.

Coopersmith, Stanley. "A Method for Determining Types of Self Esteem," Journal of Educational Research, 59:87-94, 1959.

_____. "Studies in Self Esteem," Scientific American, 218(2):96-106, February, 1968.

Dennis, G. D. "Attitudes of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Groups Toward Education," Journal of Social Psychology, 57:249-56, 1962.

Dworkin, Anthony G. "Stereotypes and Self Images Held by Native Born and Foreign Born Mexican Americans," Sociology and Social Research, 49 (2):214-24, 1965.

Gaier, Eugene L., and Helen S. Wambach. "Self Evaluation of Personality Assets and Liabilities of Southern White and Negro Students," Journal of Social Psychology, 51:131-43, February, 1960.

Harris, E. E. "Family and Student Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and We-Group Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, 34:17-22, 1965.

_____. "Racial and National Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and We-Group Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, 34:425-30, 1965.

Hawk, Travis L. "Self Concepts of the Socially Disadvantaged," Elementary School Journal, 67(6):196-206, 1967.

Herman, Sister Mary. "Self Concept of the Negro Child," Catholic School Journal, 66:62-63, April, 1966.

Hill, T. J. "Attitudes Toward Self: An Experimental Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, 30:395-97, 1957.

Jantz, L. L., and Robert J. Havighurst. "Relations Between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community II: Sixteen Year Old Boys and Girls," Journal of Educational Psychology, 36:499-509, November 1945.

Joseph, E. A. "Selected Aspects of the Internality of the Negro in Education," Education, 88:149-52, November, 1967.

Kelly, Harry. "Adolescents: A Suppressed Minority Group," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:630-45, March, 1969.

Kinch, John. "Formalized Theory: The Self Concept," American Journal of Sociology, 68:481-86, 1963.

Klausner, Samuel Z. "Social Class and Self Concept," Journal of Social Psychology, 38:251-5, 1953.

La Benne, Wallace. "A Theoretical Framework for Behavior Analysis and Intervention," Psychology, 5(2):14-19, 1968.

Lefkowitz, J. "Self Esteem of Industrial Workers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 53(6):521-24, 1967.

Lipton, Aaron. "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self Esteem," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36:211-15, January, 1963.

Lundholm, H. "Reflections upon the Nature of the Psychological Self," Psychological Review, 47:110-27, 1940.

Mason, Evelyn P. "Some Factors in Self Judgments," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 10:336-40, 1954.

McDonald, Robert L., and Malcolm D. Gynther. "MMPI Differences Associated with Sex, Race, and Social Class in Two Adolescent Samples," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 27:112-16, 1963.

_____. "Relationship of Self and Ideal Self Descriptions with Sex, Race, and Class in Southern Adolescents," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1(1):85-88, 1965.

Mead, Margaret. "The Implications of Culture Change for Personality Development," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 17:633-46, 1947.

Monat, Charles E. "Four, Poor, Nonwhite and Out-of-Sight," Young Children, 24:4-14, October, 1968.

Pouissaint, A. F., and C. G. Atkinson. "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," Journal of Negro Education, 37:241-51, 1968.

Rabban, M. "Sex Role Identification in Young Children in Two Diverse Groups," Psychology Monographs, 42:81-154, 1950.

Radke, M. J., and H. G. Trager. "Children's Perceptions of the Social Role of Negroes and Whites," Journal of Psychology, 29:3-33, 1950.

Radke, M. J. Sutherland, and P. Rosenberg. "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13:154-71, 1950.

Rosenkrantz, Paul, Helen Bee, Susan Vogel, Inge Broverman, and Donald Broverman. "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(3):287-95, 1968.

Roth, Robert M. "The Role of Self Concept in Achievement," Journal of Experimental Education, 27:265-81, 1959.

Sears, Pauline S. "Level of Aspiration in Academically Successful and Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 35:498-536, 1940.

Smith, D. H. "A Summer Science Project to Enhance Self Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, 36(2):177-80, 1967.

Smuts, R. W. "The Negro Community and the Development of Negro Potential," Journal of Negro Education, 26:456-65, 1957.

Snyder, E. E. "Self Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," The Clearing House, 40:242-46, December, 1965.

Sochet, M. A. "Social Class Awareness of Lower Class Children as Revealed in their Concepts of Adult Preferences, Ideals, and Self Images," International Review of Education, 10(3):341-46, 1964.

Sparks, G. "The Learner's Concept of Self," American Council on Education Studies, 13(35):97-99, 1949.

Wattenberg, W.W., and C. Clifford. "Relationship of Self Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading," Child Development, 35:461-67, 1964.

Williams, Robert L., and Harry Byars. "Negro Self Esteem in a Transitional Society: Tennessee Self Concept Scale," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:120-25, October, 1968.

Williams, Robert L., and Sturgeon Cole. "Self Concept and School Adjustment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46(5):478-81, 1968.

Wylie, Ruth C. "Children's Estimates of Their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Levels," Journal of Personality, 31:203-24, June, 1963.

Yarrow, Marian R., Helen G. Trager, and Nathaniel Dyson. "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 40:327-47, 1949.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Anderson, C. M. "The Self Image: A Theory of the Dynamics of Behavior," The Self in Growth, Teaching, and Learning, D. E. Hamachek, editor. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965. P. 7.

Ausubel, D. P., and P. Ausubel. "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," Education in Depressed Areas, A. H. Passow, editor. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 109-41.

Dai, G. "Minority Group Membership and Personality Development," Race Relations: Problems and Theory, J. Masuoka and P. Valien, editors. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961. Pp. 141-99.

Deutsch, Martin. "Minority Groups and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement," The Disadvantaged Child, Martin Deutsch and Associates, editors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967. P. 108.

Grambs, Jean D. "The Self Concept: Basis for Re-Education of Negro Youth," Negro Self Concept: Implications for School and Citizenship, William C. Kvaraceus, editor. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965. P. 13.

Long, Barbara, and E. H. Henderson. "Self Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," Children: Behavior and Development, Boyd McCandless, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967. P. 272.

Olson, W., and W. Wattenberg. "The Role of the School in Mental Health," Mental Health in Modern Education, p. 105. Sixty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Bodwin, Raymond F. "The Relationship Between Immature Self Concept and Certain Educational Disabilities." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967. (Dissertation Abstracts, 17:564, 1957).

Brugh, Max. "A Study of Age Differences and Sex Differences in the Relationship Between Self Concept and Grade Point Average." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967 (Dissertation Abstracts, 17:564, 1957.)

Cardoza, Ignacio R. "The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement and Alienation Among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students." Paper presented at the Conference on Teacher Education for Mexican-Americans, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, February 11, 1968.

Crosswell, Albert B. "A Study of Selected Cognitive and Affective Variables Functioning in Two Sub-Groups of Lower Economic Class Fifth and Sixth Grade Pupils in a Non-Metropolitan Area." Unpublished Doctoral

dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1966. (Dissertation Abstracts, 27:2721-22, 1967.)

Georgeoff, P. J. "The Effect of the Curriculum upon the Self Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classes." Paper read at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, February, 1964.

Godbold, Donald H. "A Comparison of Attitudes Towards School, Self Perception, and Achievement of Eighth Grade Pupils Attending Junior High Schools in Communities of Different Levels of Economic Affluence." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1967. (Dissertation Abstracts, 28-3460-61, 1968.)

Goldstein, Margaret. "Mental Health, Social Status, and Maslow's Need System." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York, 1967. (Dissertation Abstracts, 28-2122-24, 1967.)

Guggenheim, Warren C. "Self Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1963. (Dissertation Abstracts, 23-3007-4, 1963.)

Hollingshead, A.B. "Two Factor Index of Social Position." New Haven, Connecticut, 1957. (Mimeographed.)

Lumpkin, Donavan D. "Relationship of Self Concept to Achievement in Reading." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1958. (Dissertation Abstracts, 19-204-5, 1958.)

Maxwell, Joseph W. "The Relationship of Family Adjustment to the Self Concept of Lower Class Adolescent Males." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1967. (Dissertation Abstracts, 28-2353-54, 1967.)

McDaniel, Dona K. "Correlates of Self Concept in Gifted Students." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. (Dissertation Abstracts, 27-1440, 1967.)

Miller, William E. "Factor Analytic Study of Perception of Self, Others, and the Environment." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1968. (Dissertation Abstracts, 29-908, 1967).

Overstreet, Phoebe L. "Factors Associated with the Quality of Self Evaluations." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1958. (Dissertation Abstracts, 20:761-62, 1959.)

Raimy, V.C. "The Self Concept as a Factor in Counseling and Personality Organization." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1943.

Reeder, Thelma A. "A Study of Some Relationships Between Levels of Self Concept, Academic Achievement and Classroom Adjustment." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, Denton, 1955. (Dissertation Abstracts, 16:498, 1956.)

Romaglia, G.A. "Some Correlates of the Self Structure as Measured by an Index of Adjustment and Values." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1952. (Dissertation Abstracts, 12:794, 1952.)

Silverman, Marvin I. "The Relationship Between Self Esteem and Aggression in Two Social Classes." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1963. (Dissertation Abstracts, 25:2836, 1964.)

APPENDIX A

HOLLINGSHEAD TWO FACTOR INDEX OF SOCIAL POSITION

I. The Scale Scores

To determine the social position of an individual or of a household, two items are essential: (1) the precise occupational role the head of the household performs in the economy; and (2) the amount of formal schooling he has received. Each of these factors is then graded according to the following system of scores:

A. The Occupational Scale

1. Higher Executives, Proprietors of Large Concerns, and the Major Professionals

a. Higher Executives

Bank Presidents, Vice Presidents
Judges (Superior Courts)
Large Businesses, e.g., Directors, Presidents, Vice Presidents, Asst. Vice Presidents, Executive Secretary, Treasurer
Military, Commissioned Officers, Major and above
Officials of the Executive Branch of Government, Federal, State, Local, e.g., Mayor, City Manager, City Plan Director, Internal Revenue Directors
Research Directors, Large Firms

b. Large Proprietors (Value over $100,000)

Brokers	Dairy Owners
Contractors	Lumber Dealers

c. Major Professionals

Accountants (C.P.A.)	Astronomers
Actuaries	Auditors
Agronomists	Bacteriologists
Architects	Chemical Engineers
Artists, Portrait	Chemists

Clergy (Professionally trained)	Metallurgists
Dentists	Physicians
Economists	Physicists, Research
Engineers (Coll. Grad.)	Psychologists, Practicing
Foresters	Symphony Conductor
Geologists	Teachers, University, College
Lawyers	Veterinarians (Veterinary Surgeons)

2. Business Managers, Proprietors of Medium Sized Businesses, and Lesser Professionals

a. Business Managers in Large Concerns

Advertising Directors	Office Managers
Branch Managers	Personnel Managers
District Managers	Police Chief; Sheriff
Brokerage Salesmen	Postmaster
Executive Assistants	Production Manager
Executive Managers	Sales Engineers
Govt. Officials minor, e.g., Internal Revenue Agents	Sales Mangers, National Concerns
Farm Managers	Sales Managers (over $100,000)

b. Proprietors of Medium Business (Value $35,000-$100,000)

Advertising Owners ($100,000)	Manufacturer's Representatives
Clothing Store Owners $100,000)	Poultry Business ($100,000)
Contractors ($100,000)	Purchasing Managers
Express Company Owners ($100,000)	Real Estate Brokers ($100,000)
Fruits, Wholesale ($100,000)	Rug Business ($100,000)
Furniture Business ($100,000)	Store Owners ($100,000)
Jewelers ($100,000)	Theater Owners ($100,000)
Labor Relations Consultants	

c. Lesser Professionals

Accountants (not C.P.A.)	Chiropodists

Chiropractors	Statisticians (Bachelor Graduate)
Correction Officers	Nurses
Director of Community Hosps	Opticians
Engineers (not coll. grad.)	Pharmacists
Finance Writers	Public Health Officers (M.P.H.)
Health Educators	Research Assistants, University (full time)
Librarians	Social Workers
Military, Commissioned Officers, Lts., Capts.	Teachers (elementary and high)

3. Administrative Personnel, Small Independent Businesses, and Minor Professionals

a. Administrative Personnel

Advertising Agents	Section Heads, Federal, State, and Local Govt. Offices
Chief Clerks	Section Heads, Large Businesses and Industries
Credit Managers	Service Managers
Insurance Agents	Shop Managers
Managers, Department Stores	Store Managers (chain)
Passenger Agents--R.R.	Traffic Managers
Private Secretaries	
Purchasing Agents	
Sales Representatives	

b. Small Business Owners ($5,000 - $50,000)

Art Gallery	Foundry
Auto Accessories	Funeral Directors
Awnings	Furniture
Bakery	Garage
Beauty Shop	Gas Station
Boatyard	Glassware
Brokerage, Insurance	Grocery (general)
Car Dealers	Cigarette Machines
Cattle Dealers	Cleaning Shops
Feed	Clothing
Finance Co., Local	Coal Business
Fire Extinguishers	Convalescent Homes
I.B.M.	Dentistry
Florist	Dry Wall
Food Equipment	Dry Goods
Food Products	Engraving Business

[illegible]

Monuments
Package Store (Liquor)
Painting Contracting
Plumbing
Poultry Producers
Publicity & Public Relations
Real Estate
Records and Radios
Restaurant
Roofing Contractor
Shoe
Signs
Taxicab Type Company
Tire Shop

Total Employment
Sch. of Music
Security
Machinery Brokers
Manufacturing
Printing
Trucks and Tractors
Upholstery
Wholesale Outlet
Window Shades

c. Semi-Professional

Actors and Showmen
Army Mil Spt - Navy C.P.O.
Artists, Commercial
Assistants (Librarians)
Clergymen not profession-
ally trained
Concrete Managers
Deputy Sheriffs
Dispatchers, R.R. Trans
Interior Decorators
Interpreters, Court
Laboratory Assistants
Landscape Planners

Morticians
Oral Hygienists
Photographers
Physio-therapists
Piano Teachers
Radio, T.V. Announcers
Reporters, Court
Reporters, Newspaper
Surveyors
Title Examiners
Tool Designers
Travel Agents
Yard Masters, R.R.

d. Foremen

Farm Owners ($25,000-$50,000)

3. Clerical and Sales Workers, Technicians, and Owners of Little Businesses (Value-sales $5,000)

a. Clerical and Sales Workers

Bank Clerks and Tellers
Bill Collectors
Bookkeepers
Business Machine Opera-
tors, Office

Claims Examiners
Clerical or Stenographic
Conductor, R.R.
Employment Interviewers
Factory Storekeeper

-2a-

Factory Supervisor
Route Managers
Sales Clerks
Shipping Clerks

Supervisors, Utilities, Factories
Toll Station Supervisors
Warehouse Clerks

5. Technicians

Dental Technicians
Draftsmen
Driving Teachers
Inspectors, Factory
Experimental Tester
Instructors, Telephone Co., Factory
Inspectors, Weights, Sanitary, B.S., Factory
Investigators
Laboratory Technicians
Locomotive Engineers

Operators, P.B.X.
Proofreaders
Safety Supervisors
Supervisors, Maintenance
Technical Assistants
Telephone Co. Supervisors
Timekeepers
Tower Operators, B.S.
Truck Dispatchers
Window Trimmers (Buses)

6. Owners of Little Businesses

Flower Shop ($5,000-$9,999)
Restaurant ($5,000-$9,999)
Tailor Shop ($5,000-$9,999)

8. Farmers

Owners ($10,000-$20,000)

9. Skilled Manual Employees

Auto Body Repairers
Bakers
Barbers
Blacksmiths
Bricklayers
Bulldozer Operators
Butchers
Cabinet Makers
Carpenters
Cement Finishers

Compositors
Decorators
Diesel Engine Repair and Maintenance Trained
Diesel Diesel Operators
Electricians
Electrotypers
Engravers
Entertainers
Fitters, Gas, Steam

Foreman, City
Foreman, R.R.
Foreman, Construction, Dairy
Gardeners, Landscape (Trained)
Gauge Makers
Glassblowers
Glaziers
Hair Stylists
Heat Treaters
Horticulturists
Lineman, Utility
Linoleum Layers (Trained)
Linotype Operators
Lithographers
Locksmiths
Loom Fixers
Machinists (Trained)
Maintenance Foreman
Metalizers, Electrical Appliances
Mixers
Molders
Mechanics (Trained)
Millwrights
Moulders (Trained)
Painters
Paperhangers
Patternmen, R.R.
Pattern and Model Makers
Piano Builders
Piano Tuners
Plumbers
Policeman, City
Postman
Printers
Radio, T.V., Maintenance
Repairman, Home Appliances
Rope Splicers
Shoetential Workers (Trained)
Shipwrights
Shoe Repairmen (Trained)
Stationary Engineers (Licensed)
Stewards, Club
Switchmen, R.R.
Tailors (Trained)
Teletype Operators
Toolmakers
Track Supervisors, R.R.
Tractor-Trailer Trans.
Typographers
Upholsterers (Trained)
Watchmakers
Weavers
Welders
Yard Supervisors, R.R.

Small Farms

Owners (Under $15,000)
Tenants who own farm equipment

4. Machine Operators and Semi-Skilled Employees

Aides, Hospital
Apprentices, Electricians
Printers, Newspapers, Typesetters
Barbers, Beauticians
Bingo Tenders
Building Superintendents (Cont.)
Bus Drivers
Checkers
Coin Machine Fillers
Clerks, Part-Time
Delivery Men

Dressmakers, Machine
Elevator Operators
Enlisted Men, Military Services
Fitters, Benders, Buffers
Foundry Workers
Garage and Gas Station Assistants
Greenhouse Workers
Guards, Doorkeepers, Watchmen
Hairdressers
Housekeepers
Meat Cutters and Packers
Motor Scalers
Operators, Factory Machines
Oilers, N.E.
Practical Nurses
Pressers, Clothing
Pump Operators
Receivers and Checkers
Roofers
Set-up Men, Factories
Shapers
Signalmen, R.R.
Solderers, Factory
Sprayers, Paint
Steelworkers (Not Skilled)
Stranders, Wire Machines
Strippers, Rubber Factory
Taxi Drivers
Testers
Timers
Tire Builders
Trainmen, R.R.
Truck Drivers, General
Waiters-Waitresses ("Better Places")
Weighers
Welders, Spot
Winders, Machine
Wiredrawers, Machine
Wire Benders
Wool Workers, Machine
Wrappers, Stores and Factories

Farmers

Small tenants who own little equipment

F. Unskilled Employees

Amusement Park Workers (Bowling Alley, Pool Rooms)
Ash Removers
Attendants, Parking Lots
Cafeteria Workers
Car Cleaners, R.R.
Car Helpers, R.R.
Carriers, Coal
Carrymen
Dairy Workers
Deck Hands
Domestics
Farm Helpers
Fishermen (Clam Diggers)
Freight Handlers
Garbage Collectors
Grave Diggers
Hod Carriers
Hog Killers
Hospital Workers (Unspecified)
Hostler, R.R.
Janitors, Sweepers
Laborers, Construction
Laborers, Unspecified
Laundry Workers
Messengers

Platform Man, R.R.
Peddlers
Porters
Roofer's Helpers
Shoe Fitters
Shoe Shiners
Sorters, Rag and
Salvage
Stagehands
Stevedores
Stock Handlers

Street Cleaners
Unskilled Factory Workers
Truckman, R.R.
Watchmen ("Night Hounds")
Washers, Cars
Woodchoppers

Relief, Public, Private

Unemployed (No Occupation)

Farmers

Share Croppers

This scale is premised upon the assumption that occupations have different values attached to them by the members of our society. The hierarchy ranges from the low evaluation of unskilled physical labor toward the more prestigeful use of skill, through the creative talents of ideas, and the manipulation of men. The ranking of occupation functions implies that some men exercise control over the occupational pursuits of other men. Normally, a person who possesses highly trained skills has control over several other people. This is exemplified in a highly developed form by an executive in a large business enterprise who may be responsible for decisions affecting thousands of employees.

b. The Educational Scale

The educational scale is premised upon the assumption that men and women who possess similar educations will tend to have similar tastes and similar attitudes, and they will also tend to exhibit similar behavior patterns. The educational scale is divided into seven positions: (1) Graduate Professional Training (persons who complete a recognized professional course leading to a graduate degree are given scores 1). (2) Standard College or University (all individuals who complete a four-year college or university course leading to a recognized college degree are assigned to the same scores. No differentiation is m. de between state universities or private colleges). (3) Partial College Training (all those who complete at least one year but not a full college course are assigned this position. Most individuals in this category complete from one to three years of college). (4) High School Graduate (all secondary school graduates, whether from a private preparatory school, a public high school, a trade school, or a parochial high school, are assigned to consecutive ratios). (5) Partial High School

[illegible] who complete the tenth or the eleventh grades, but do not complete high school are given this score. (6) Junior High School [illegible] who complete the seventh grade through the ninth grade are given this position. (7) Less Than Seven Years of School [illegible] who do not complete the seventh grade are given the same scores, irrespective of the amount of education they possess.

B. Integration of Two Factors

The factors of Occupation and Education are combined by weighting the individual scores obtained from the scale positions. The weights for each factor were determined by multiple correlation techniques. The weight for each factor is:

Factor	Factor Weight
Occupation	7
Education	4

To calculate the Index of Social Position score for an individual, the scale value for Occupation is multiplied by the factor weight for Occupation, and the scale value for Education is multiplied by the factor weight for Education. For example, John Smith is the manager of a chain supermarket. He completed high school and one year of business college. His Index of Social Position score is computed as follows:

Factor	Scale Score	Factor Weight	Score x Weight
Occupation	5	7	35
Education	3	4	12
		Index of Social Position Score:	47

C. Index of Social Position Scores

The Two Factor Index of Social Position Scores may be arranged on a continuum, or divided into groups of scores. The range of scores on a continuum is from a low of 11 to a high of 77. For some purposes a researcher may desire to work with a continuum of scores. For other purposes he may desire to break the continuum into a hierarchy of score groups.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please Answer the following statements by checking (X) your answer.

1. I am a (a) boy_____
(b) girl_____

2. I am (a) Anglo_____
(b) Indian_____
(c) Negro_____
(d) Spanish-American_____
(e) Other (please specify)_____

3. I am (a) 10-11 years old _____
(b) 12-13 years old _____
(c) 14-15 years old _____
(d) 16-17 years old _____

4. I am now in (a) English class_____
(b) Math. class _____
(c) Social Studies class_____

5. The last grade that my father finished in school was
(a) 6th grade_____
(b) 7th grade_____
(c) 8th grade_____
(d) 9th grade_____
(e) 10th grade_____
(f) 11th grade_____
(g) 12th grade_____
(h) 1st year college_____
(i) 2nd year college_____
(j) 3rd year college_____
(k) college graduate_____
(l) Graduate School or Professional Training_____

6. Please state the kind of work your father does. _____

_____